

APN 0 122

Ethnicity, Women and Education

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Women an International Perspective
(Co-author)

Sex Race Ethnicity and Education
(Co-author)

Conflict Permanency Change and Education
(Co-author)

Immigrants and Ethnics
(Co-author)

Ethnicity,
Women
and
Education

EDITED BY
Dr. MICHAEL V. BELOK

published by

anu prakashan

MEERUT-250 001

INDIA

Cat
373.082
B41E

Ethnicity, Women and Education

Published By :

Kailash Mithal
ANU PRAKASHAN
Shivaji Road, Meerut City-250 001 (INDIA)

© RESERVED

Price Rs. 60/- \$ 12 00

Printed By :

Deepak Mithal
G. T. PRINTERS
Bombay Bazar, Meerut Cantt-250 001 (INDIA).

PREFACE

In planning this book, the editor tried to bring together a collection of papers exhibiting new perspectives and approaches to the study of immigrants, ethnics, and women. The contributors chose topics with which they were especially familiar. Their papers show the depth of insight which comes from a command of their subjects. The contributors also show a common disposition to examine uncommon topics and to engage in ground-breaking research.

This book should be useful to specialists and students alike. It should also be of the interest to the intelligent reader and it is hoped he can read it with pleasure and intellectual profit.

The editor wishes to express his gratitude to all the authors. Their contributions unfailing display superlative scholarship and literary craftsmanship. A debt is acknowledged to Andrew M. Greeley, Nancy Gallagher McCready, and Geogre Connelley for allowing us to publish their touching poems.

MICHAEL V. BELOK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The publisher expresses his thanks and indebtedness to those who have helped in this project and specially thankful to Dr. Michael V. Belok, College of Education, Arizona State University, Arizona Tempe, U.S.A., who devoted his valuable time in the collection of the articles and editing it.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGES
Introduction	xi
Contributors	xv
1 Immigration and Quantification : Recent Studies in Post Civil War Immigration. RALPH SHOUB	1
2 The American Achievement : A Report from Great Ireland. ANDREW M. GREELEY	17
3 The Italian Americans : A Bicentennial Perspectives. RUDOLPH J. VECOLI	41
4 Carpatho-Ruthenian Resources and Assimilation 1880-1924 : A Preliminary Survey. RICHARD RENOFF	53
5 The Ukrainian Community in Ohio 1885-1976. G. KULCHYCKY	79
6 The Early Russian Feminists and the Struggle for Higher Education for Women. RUTH A. DUDGEON	95
7 Poles in American ; A Bicentennial View. FRANK MOCHA	107

CHAPTER	PAGES
8 Ethnicity and Social Control. MICHAEL V. BELOK	118
9 Julia Richman : Agent of Change in the Urban School. SELMA C. BERROL	129
10 The Influence of Ella Flagg Young on John Dewey's Educational Thought. JOAN K. SMITH	143
11 Women's Clubs and Hearts in the Bid for Progressive Education. JACK K. CAMPBELL	155
12 Samples of the American Feminine Mind : Focus on Mary Whiton Calkins as Philosopher. ARTHUR W. MUNK	170
13 Immigrant Nationalism and Feminism : Glos Polek and the Polish Women's Alliance in America, 1898-1917. THADDEUS C. RADZIAŁOWSKI	183
14 Success Through Moderation : The Development of Higher Education for Women in Nineteenth Century Russia. PAUL W. JOHNSON	204
15 Ethnicity and Cultural Retention : Finns in Canada, 1890-1920. J. DONALD WILSON	217
16 Female Power in Changing India : Myth or Reality ? HEATHER T. FRAZER.	236

INTRODUCTION

Recently there has been a revival of interest in the groups discussed in this volume. Books and articles have poured from the presses in increasing numbers. One cause has been the increasing interest in their own past by the many ethnic groups making up American society. But ethnicity has been a far-ranging phenomenon and the renewed interest of scholars in ethnic groups may partially be attributed to the disorders of present. Throughout the world, various ethnic groups are once more pushing their claims for recognition. Almost no country is free of ethnic conflicts.

In the United States, the revival of interest in ethnic groups and their immigrant forebearers can be attributed, in part, to the disorders of the 1960's brought on by the struggle of the visible minorities for civil and economic rights. As the white ethnics watched the Blacks, Hispanic Americans, and American Indians utilizing different strategies to achieve greater social, political and economic equality, they too began to adopt some techniques of these groups. If there could be Black, Red, and Brown power, then there could be Irish power, Polish power, etc. Soon there was a revival of interest in the ethnic heritages. Not that interest in the history of immigration and the American response to it had ever entirely subsided but the revival could be measured in quantitative terms. There were more studies of various immigrant groups than there had been for decades. A trend was unmistakable; scholars were paying more attention to groups which had been neglected in prior years.

The yearbooks of the National Council of Social Studies illustrate this trend. The yearbook published in 1961, *Interpreting and Teaching American History*, did not discuss the subject of immigrant and ethnic history. The latest yearbook devoted to American history, *The Reinterpretation of American History and Culture*, published in 1973, devotes a whole chapter to the literature of ethnic history written by Rudolph Vecoli, one of the contributors to this volume. Furthermore, the *Yearbook* makes a distinction between white ethnics and the other groups whose differences are primarily of race.

The present volume, *Immigrants, Ethnics and Women*, also concentrates on ethnic and immigrants but does pay some attention to the matter of ethnicity and its relationship to social control. *Immigrants, Ethnics, and Women* also is unusual in that considerable space and attention is given to the "new Immigrants", the Italians, Ukrainians, Ruthenians and Poles, groups that usually do not have much space devoted to them in more recent collections of research. In fact, the Ruthenians are virtually ignored in most writings on immigrants and ethnics. It is hoped that the inclusion of the chapter by Richard Renoff devoted to the Ruthenians will introduce this groups to many who are unaware of them and also stimulate research concerning the Ruthenians.

Ralph Shoub begins the volume with an overview of immigration research paying particular attention to new research models and techniques used by contemporary historians. He is followed by several papers devoted to the ethnic groups. Although several of the papers are celebrative in some respects, they do not fall into the error of fileopietism so common in earlier writings about immigrants. The authors display the kind of sophistication one has a right to expect from distinguished scholars. It is in this respect that the volume differs from many of the same genre. Andrew M. Greeley, a master of empirical research and quantification, writes a beautiful paper on the Irish which celebrates the Irish achievement but does so with subtle insights and solid research. His is the only paper dealing with a group that is not of the "new immigration". Rodolph Vecoli discusses the Italians and again displays the skills of a master historian while moving beyond his role of historian to offer some ideas about the future influence of Italians on American life. Renoff presents a great deal of information about the Ruthenians and displays an immense knowledge of these people and an admirable objectivity. George discusses the Ukrainians another group unfamiliar to many people. Frank Mocha discusses the Polish Americans. Finally Michael V. Belok discusses ethnicity and social control.

Women Studies are flourishing in American colleges and universities and almost every college of any consequence has a women studies program. The revival of is attributed by some to the publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. Actually many writers were showing great interest much earlier. We need not go back to Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the*

Rights of Women published in 1792 to make a case. Simon de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949) is a very important book which contends that "society has always been in the hands of men." Stressing the inferior position of women she sees the male as an oppressor. The result is that many women were pushed into an inferior position and alienated from society and self.

It is at this point that the similarities of immigrants and women become apparent. Both groups are characterized by an inferior status and both exhibit characteristics of marginality. Women seeking to enter high status positions in the work force may very well encounter cultural conflicts. Socialized to accept an inferior status and roles which define her, she may find she cannot gain acceptance in her new culture. The academic woman is a good example. Traditionally, college teaching has been viewed as a male occupation. Both the wider culture and the academic subculture have difficulty in accepting her in the new role. She has been socialized to different roles by home, school, and society. Facing contradictory expectations she may become estranged from both the main culture and the academic culture. In order to fulfil the role of a professor she may have to be more assertive but her loyalties to the culturally defined roles of her early socialization may contribute to inhibitions and even self-hatred.

As a product of two cultural conditions, there emerges a clash between the two identifications. A woman may react with violent emotion against the old identification ; yet, though shaken the old identification continues to exist. Her life process is caught in a web of ambivalent attitudes and sentiments. She is torn between two courses of action which do not permit her calmly taking one and leaving the other. Her ambivalence may contribute to nervous and to irrational, moody, and "temperamental" conduct. She often tries to compensate for this felt inferiority by excessive aggressiveness ; in addition, she is characterized by egocentrism, withdrawing tendencies, a proclivity for rationalizing, and an hypercritical disposition.

The type of marginal personality described above is very often found in fictional portrayals of academic women. The present writer studied college professors characterizations in novels published between 1940 and 1957 and found an unusually high proportion of women professors characterized in this fashion. A doctoral dissertation by Pauline Staib under his direction studied the

academic woman from the earliest period to the present and found substantially the same characterizations. After a decade of intense interest in women and sexism, the novelists (most of whom were college professors) depicted women professors just as they had in the earlier study.

It must be noted that not all women experience the sort of conflicts and role difficulties identified above. Many are able to fit into their new roles very well. Still the writing of many feminists suggest that problems similar to those delineated still persist.

The writers in this volume stress the successful functioning of women in their new roles. Selma Berrol presents a portrait of a very successful woman, Julia Richman ; but, Berrol is finally forced to pose the question : "Was self-hatred the cause of her anger ?" Her answer is "Perhaps." Berroll does not examine Julia Richman's life within the theoretical structure presented above although she comes close. Her portrayal of Julia Richman as an "agent of change" and as an example of career opportunities that existed for educated women at the turn of the nineteenth century is as she writes "information of value to the women's movement in their search for a usable past." John K. Smith discusses the influence of Ella Flagg Young upon John Dewey and suggests that she may have been more successful in integrating thought to action than Dewey. Jack K. Campbell writing of the part played by women's clubs in promoting progressive education and suggests that women clubbers may have sensed that progressive practices also promoted more "positive opposite-sex interactions among children." Arthur Munk examines the careers of several successful women. Thaddeus C. Radzialowski examines Polish-American feminists in what is a ground-breaking study. He presents a facet of American feminism that has been neglected by historians. Paul W. Johnson and Ruth Dudgeon explore the development of higher education for women in Czarist Russia. Heather T. Frazer explores female power in India and shows that it is more a myth than reality.

Taken together this collection of papers shed considerable light on women both in the United States of America and India and Russia. They are part of the continuing effort to present women with a "usable past".

CONTRIBUTORS

RALPH SHOUB is a doctoral candidate at Arizona State University, Tempe, and the author of several scholarly articles. He has presented papers to several scholarly conferences.

DR. ANDREW M. GREELEY is the Director, Center for the Study of American Pluralism, University of Chicago. He is the author of several outstanding books. His latest is *The American Catholic*.

DR. RUDOLPH J. VECOLI is Professor of History at the University of Minnesota and Director of the Center for Immigration Studies. He is the author of numerous articles and *People of New Jersey*.

DR. RICHARD RENOFF is Professor of Sociology at Nassau Community College and the Editor of *Proceedings of the Conference on Carpatho-Ruthenian Immigration*. He is the author of several articles and has a book in preparation, *Celibacy and Schism : The Loss of Community among the American Carpatho-Ruthenians*.

DR. GEORGE KULCHYCKY is Associate Professor of History, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio-U.S.A. He has read papers at regional and national scholarly conferences.

DR. RUTH A. DUDGEON teaches at Georgetown University and has read papers at scholarly conferences.

DR. FRANK MOCHA teaches at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago and his latest book (in press) is *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*.

DR. MICHAEL V. BELOK is Professor of Education, Arizona State University. He published numerous articles and books. His latest book is *Conflict, Permanency, Change and Education* co-authored with James Van Patten and Joseph Roucek.

SELMA C. BERROL is Professor of History, Baruch College, The City University of New York. She has published in various scholarly journals.

JOAN K. SMITH teaches at Iowa State University and has read scholarly papers related to women in the History of Education.

JACK K. CAMPBELL is Professor of Education at Texas A & M University and is the author of *Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader*.

ARTHUR W. MUNK is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy and Resident Scholar at Albion College. He is the author of several books among them, *Roy Wood Sellars as Creative Thinker and Critic*.

THADDEUS C. RADZIAŁOWSKI is Associate Professor of History, Southwest State University. He is a recipient of a Research Grant-in-Aid for the Immigration History Research Center.

PAUL W. JOHNSON is Assistant Professor of History at Georgia State University.

J. DONALD WILSON is a Historian of Education and teaches at The University of British Columbia.

HEATHER T. FRAZER is Assistant Professor of History at Florida Atlantic University.

1

Immigration and Quantification : Recent Studies in Post-Civil War Immigration

RALPH SHOUB

During the past decade and a half quantitative research dealing with late 19th and early 20th century immigration has generally not engendered the controversy that quantitative studies dealing with the slavery issue have. To a great extent the reason for this may be the limited controversiality of the immigration issue itself and also the limited disagreement between the findings of these studies and those of a more descriptive nature.

Although many of these quantitative studies are still debating the relative importance of the "pull" vs. the "push" factors as the dominant stimulant to immigration, more recent research has dealt with immigrant distribution in America, relative income levels of native and immigrant workers, and immigrant voting behaviour. The purpose of this paper is to briefly review a sampling of this research and its relationship to the more traditional interpretations of these issues.

The question of whether the immigrant was "pushed" into immigration due to conditions in the sending country or "pulled" by conditions in the receiving country (in this case, the United States) has generally been resolved by the descriptive historian by emphasizing both. If he was "pushed" out of his home country by changing political, economic, or social conditions, he was

attracted to America by the "pull" of better conditions existing here rather than some other location. As Maldwyn Jones stated in his survey of American immigration :

The motives for immigration have been very similar first to last ; they have been always a mixture of yearnings— for riches, for land, for change, for tranquillity, for freedom, and for something not definable in words Whenever [the immigrants] came, the fact that they had been uprooted from their old surroundings meant that they faced the necessity of coming to terms with an unfamiliar environment and a new status.¹

For the economic historian interested in immigration, the debate still continues as to which factor or group of factors was the most significant.

Richard A. Easterlin² in his study concerning the influences in European overseas emigration before World War I opted for the importance of the "pull" factors. Largely replicating the work of Kuznets and Jerome, Easterlin although considering the importance of population increase and income level in the sending country as factors affecting immigration, concluded that "..... the relation [was] not pervasive enough to dominate the picture."³ More significant were the "..... fluctuations in the growth of the demand for labor abroad, particularly in the primary destination country, the United States. This influence [was] apparent both in short term business cycle fluctuations and the longer Kuznets cycles of 15 to 20 years duration."⁴

More recently, Maurice Wilkinson⁵, utilizing a neoclassical production and consumer model, has claimed that prior to World War I European migration to the United States was, "..... significantly influenced by both employment opportunities in the particular European country and the gain in real income to be achieved by migration to the United States."⁶ Thus push factors figure significantly in stimulating emigration through both a decrease in employment opportunities and lower relative wages in relation to those offered in the United States. In addition to these findings Wilkinson discovered that an inverse relationship existed between "..... the significance of United States demand for labor and the level of economic development of the European countries."⁷

The push-pull controversy is intensified when one examines studies concerned with specific countries. Gallaway and Vedder,⁸ in examining emigration from the United Kingdom to the United States between 1860 and 1913, generally supported the conclusions reached by Easterlin concerning the relative importance of the "push" factors in international migrations. Utilizing a regression analysis, they found business conditions in the United States explained 27 per cent of the variation in the dependent variable (level of migration) while unemployment in the United Kingdom accounted for only 17 per cent. Additional factors such as the Panic of 1907, which added 6 percent, wages in the United Kingdom, which added 4 per cent, and "panic" variables, which added 8 per cent, were identified to explain emigration fluctuations. Thus, they concluded "... that the 'pull' variables [were] capable of explaining just over 40 per cent of the variation in emigration flows from the United Kingdom to the United States in the period 1860-1913 ..."⁹ while the "push" factors represented just 21 per cent of the variation.

John Quigley,¹⁰ however, in examining Swedish emigration between 1867 and 1908 demonstrated that "... at least for Sweden, it [was] unfair to conclude that the pattern of emigration ... was dominated by economic conditions in the United States."¹¹ Although indications were that the influence of both Swedish agricultural and industrial conditions were as important as corresponding conditions in the United States, Quigley found that the wage variable for Swedish industrial growth was a powerful retardant:

... A one percent increase in industrial wages in Sweden [could] be associated in the short run with a reduction in the level of non-agricultural emigration of over 8 per cent. On the other side of the Atlantic, neither the agricultural nor the industrial wages exerted as strong a 'pull' effect.¹²

There also appeared to be weak, but consistent, evidence that the success or failure of the Swedish harvest and population pressures measured by the lagged birth rate influenced migration among both agricultural and industrial workers.

To illustrate the influence of the push factors, Quigley concluded his study by constructing a counterfactual proposition that relocated Swedish economic development and increased real

wages in the 1850's rather than in the 1870's as it had actually occurred. He estimated that the annual migration rates during the period 1868 to 1888 "... would have been insignificant instead of the observed annual level of about 21,000,"¹³ had this counterfactual been the case.

Several variations of the push-pull theme have attempted to explain fluctuations in migration rates by isolating specific factors that seem to be most responsible. John Tomaske, using a regression analysis, discovered that "... the relationship between variations in per capita income levels and emigration rates can only be observed when the effects of friends and relatives who had previously migrated are taken into account in the specification of the model."¹⁴ Thus, an important factor influencing both migration and spatial distribution of the European immigrant in the receiving country was the availability of creditable information concerning overseas alternatives.

In a related study, Poulson and Holyfield¹⁵ claimed that systematic fluctuations in European migration to the United States could be explained by the potential emigrant's awareness of the discounted value of the costs and returns involved in staying or leaving his native country. At the point that the European country began to experience modern economic growth, the returns from migration were most likely to exceed the costs. Therefore, changes in relative income between the United States and European countries appeared to be most relevant in explaining the surge in immigration to the United States from most of these countries and the long swings in immigration to the United States from the United Kingdom.

Probably the most ambitious of the studies concerning factors influencing European migration was Jeffrey Williamson's study¹⁶ of the long term influences and impact of immigration. Williamson identified three forces that appeared to act in concert in determining European emigration: (1) differences in migration responsiveness of various countries (*e.g.*, Swedes required greater incentive to migrate than Englishmen), (2) the industrial structures of various European economies, and (3) the magnitude of industrialization and population pressure in the sending country. The interrelationship of these three factors acting in concert created what Williamson calls, negative push factors, that tended to retard emi-

gration from the Northwestern European countries initially and then spread to the Central and Southern European areas in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Using a counterfactual that eliminated these negative push factors by maintaining European employment and living standards at their 1870 levels, Williamson contended that "... America would have had a stock of immigrants in 1910 some 20 per cent larger than was in fact the case."¹⁷

In the latter half of his article, Williamson constructed four additional counterfactual models to explain the impact and influence of immigration on the United States. Responding to Brinley Thomas' position that "... each crisis of overpopulation was a milestone in the process of building up the industrial strength of America," Williamson presented a counterfactual world with no European "push" factors between 1870 and 1910. He found that "... total additions to the foreign born in America ... would have been some 19 per cent *larger* had push conditions been absent in Europe ... [but] the real wage in Eastern industry would have been lowered by only one percent either in 1890 or 1910, and industrialization, GNP growth and capital formation rates [would have only been] slightly influenced."¹⁸

The second counterfactual involved the impact of the frontier on immigration. In the first variation of this model, the Midwest land stock was held constant at its 1870 levels; in the second, the land stock continued to grow at the 4 per cent per annum rates of the early 1870's. In both variations, "... the 1910 figures confirmed that conditions at the frontier had a trivial impact on real wages, job vacancy and thus immigration from Europe."¹⁹ Had the land stock remained at the 1870 level, the immigrant population would have been only three-tenths of one percent less than the actual 1910 levels.

In the third counterfactual, Williamson was concerned with the impact of American demographic forces on immigration. In this model he allowed the population of the Northern United States to increase at the rates existent in the early 1870's rather than the decreasing rates that actually occurred between 1870 and 1910. Under this condition the average rate of labor force growth would have decreased by 4·4 percent, but "... the total stock of foreign born would have been altered by only [one] per cent."²⁰ Thus it appears unlikely that the decreasing birth rate

in the United States had a great deal to do with the increasing flow of immigrants during the period.

Williamson's final counterfactual proposes an America without immigrants after 1870. In this model he hoped to identify the effects of immigration on real wages, industrialization and the per capita GNP. While real earnings would have increased by 11 per cent in Eastern industry between 1870 and 1910 without immigration, the per capita GNP (based on 1870 prices) would have grown only 3 per cent above its actual level and industrialization would have been 6·7 percent less than the actual level for 1910. As Williamson points out in the conclusion of his study,

... an America without immigrants indeed would have grown very differently from the way she actually did in the late nineteenth century. The impact, however, would have been felt on the distribution of income and the level of industrialization rather than aggregate per capital income performance.²¹

A second major area of research in recent quantitative studies dealing with immigration has been concerned with the distribution of the immigrants once they arrived in the United States. The Dillingham Commission, created in 1907 to study the "new" immigrants, concluded that the "new" immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe settled in the cities because they were more prone to do so than the "old" immigrants from Northern and Western Europe. Marcus Lee Hanson,²² however, explained the migration to the cities by the immigrants as part of a larger urban population shift occurring in most industrialized nations during the period. More recently, Maldwyn Jones has identified the lack of capital, the limited interest in and ability to farm, and the lower agricultural wages as factors that influenced the urban rather than rural settlement of the late 19th and early 20th century immigrants.²³

Orsagh and Mooney²⁴ have attempted to construct a model in order to explain the dispersion of immigrant labor in the United States between 1880 and 1920. Using the Marshallian demand and supply apparatus, they found that "... employers tended to use more foreign-born labor relative to native labor at higher wage levels,"²⁵ probably as a means of decreasing labor costs. The immigrants, however, were discovered to be no more responsive

to differences in wage levels than their native counterparts. The most significant variable, it was found, in influencing the relative geographic distribution of the immigrants was the importance of friends and relatives in the respective areas of immigrant concentration. This appears to corroborate Tomaske's findings that were described earlier.

In regard to the immigrant's supposed propensity to settle in the cities, Gallaway and Vedder²⁶ attempted to test the increasing urbanization thesis that was advanced by the Dillingham Commission and to a limited extent implied by Hansen and Jones. In their study Gallaway and Vedder found that not only did the "new" immigrants show less tendency to congregate in the cities than the "old" immigrants, they were less prone to "...congregate in urban areas relative to the native-born."²⁷

Gallaway, Vedder, and Shukla,²⁸ in a more recent article, analyzed the distribution of immigrants in relation to economic factors. They found that turn of the century immigrants tended to have been,

... quite responsive to interstate income differentials, job opportunity ..., the presence of friends and relatives in a state, the existence of ports of entry and population density Very simply put, the settlement patterns of immigrants in this period do not appear to be the result of ignorant, random behaviour but seem to reflect instead a good deal of purposive rational action on their part.²⁹

Contrary to Orsagh and Mooney, and in some respects contradicting Gallaway and Vedder's previous study, Gallaway, *et. al.* found that,

... native born Americans tended to migrate to the less densely populated states whereas immigrants were inclined to locate in the more densely populated states. This indicate[d] a greater tendency for the foreign-born to locate in the more urbanized areas than was true for the native-born.³⁰

Thus, from this study it would appear that the immigrant was more sensitive to wage levels than was the native-born. In regard to the apparent contradiction with Gallaway and Vedder's previous study, it would appear that Gallaway, *et. al.* chose to deal with the immigrants collectively rather than as "old" or "new" source immigrants.

The economic issues related to immigrant dispersion raise another area that has intrigued historians of immigration, that of immigrant income and its relative level in comparison to native-born workers. The standard interpretation of these questions found in both Handlin³¹ and Jones,³² and more recently in Taylor³³ is that the immigrant worker was paid far less for his services than the native-born worker and was generally exploited. As Handlin states, "the immigrant was an exploited ... laborer ...," but, as qualified by Jones, "... that was simply a reflection of the fact that immigrants tended to enter the poor-paid occupations."³⁴

Robert Higgs³⁵, however, in his study of race, skills, and earnings, questions whether there exists any evidence to support the hypothesis of ethnic discrimination. Using information collected by the Immigration Commission in 1909 for workers in mining and manufacturing, Higgs attempted to show that skill differentials provided an adequate explanation for earnings differentials among various immigrant groups and native workers. Hypothesizing that literacy and the ability to speak English were the skill variables most influential in affecting wage levels, he employed a multiple regression to the Commission's data. His findings revealed that the two variables explained almost four-fifths of the variance in average earnings among the groups :

A percentage point gain in literacy—[his] proxy for general skills—was about twice as important as the same gain in the ability to speak English, [and] the ... ability to speak English was almost perfectly correlated with the duration of a group's residence in America.³⁶

The major limitation to Higg's findings, and one that he briefly touches upon, is the difficulty in making such a comparison based on weekly earnings. The immigrant laborer, much like present day minority workers, was most sensitive to the ups and downs of the economy. The "new" immigrant since he was the most recent arrival was usually layed off first and rarely was able to get a full year's work.

A more seriously flawed study is Peter Hill's³⁷ investigation of the relative skill and income level of foreign born and native workers between 1840 and 1920. Hill claims that "... the immigrants, instead of being an underpaid, exploited group, generally held an economic position that compared very favourably to

that of the native-born members of the society."³⁸ Hill's selection of data, however, seriously impairs his conclusions. First, in attempting to distinguish between the relative wage rates of native and immigrant labor, his choice of the Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor (1890) has over 25 per cent of the sample families (534) located in Southern states. Since these states not only had lower incomes but also fewer immigrants, it is likely that the income levels computed for the native-born could have been composed of upto 40 per cent of these Southern workers.

Secondly, the ethnic origins of the foreign born sample (1196 families) puts this particular portion of the study additionally in question. Over 60 per cent of this group came from English speaking countries, while an additional 23 per cent came from Germany. If there is any validity to Higgs' findings presented earlier, then one would certainly have to question any comparison between Southern literacy rates as compared to those of German and English speaking immigrants.

In a latter part of the study Hill again attempts to show the relative similarity between the wages of the native and foreign-born worker in 1901. Again his sample is flawed; in this instance, because nearly 90 per cent of the foreign-born workers come from "old" immigrant sources. There are no recent descriptive studies, to my knowledge, that contend that immigrants from Northern and Western Europe were exploited any more severely than the native-worker, with the possible exception of the Irish during the first half of the 19th century. The recent emphasis has nearly always been on the "new" immigrant from Southern and Eastern Europe.

Thirdly, in attempting to show that the total family income for the foreign born workers was 3 per cent higher than that of the native worker, Hill fails to see the social and economic implications of this difference in relation to the well-being of the native and foreign-born family. While the native-born family could generally sustain itself on the husband's income, the foreign-born family, which was 10 per cent larger and whose head was earning 6 per cent less, was forced to supplement its income by having additional members of the family employed. In purely economic terms, aside from the social implications, this meant that at least

some of the children were forced to abbreviate their schooling and seek employment, thus limiting their upward mobility as adults. In relation to this aspect, Cohen³⁹ found that Italian girls in New York City in 1920 showed a marked drop off in school attendance after the age of fifteen and high absentee rates previous to this age in order to supplement the family income.

Finally, Hill in attempting to compare the relative skill and income levels of native and foreign-born workers between 1870 and 1920, again comes to questionable conclusions. For example, he finds it quite surprising that "..... the native-born had a greater portion of their labor force in the unskilled category" than the foreign-born.⁴⁰ It should not be all that surprising when one includes Blacks and the children of immigrants in one's data. When he does provide a seriously abbreviated table that includes only native-born whites, one finds that the percentage of unskilled native-born workers drops by over 7 per cent in 1890 while the number of skilled workers increases by nearly 6 per cent. Again the problem of viewing the entire foreign-born collectively distorts the traditional interpretation since nearly 50 per cent of all foreign-born found in the cities in 1920 were from 'old' immigrant sources. Thus to argue, as Hill does in his conclusion, that "..... the immigrants did not differ markedly in any economic sense from the native-born and probably adjusted quite rapidly to economic opportunities in the United States,"⁴¹ is to alter the issue so drastically that the study adds very little to our knowledge in this area.

The final major area of recent quantitative research concerns the immigrant's political behavior. The standard descriptive interpretation is best summarized in Maldwyn Jones :

That the mass of immigrants were extremely conservative in politics was attributable to their fundamental pattern of thought. It was not so much perhaps that their preponderantly peasant origins had bred an attitude of acceptance which remained with them even in the New World ; had that been the case, the majority would never have crossed the Atlantic. Nor was submission to clerical leadership a universal factor. It was rather that their political inexperience, and the need for immediate practical help imposed upon them by circumstance, combined to prevent their accepting, or even grasping, the strange new assumption that politics was a

sphere wherein the general good might be realized through common action. Reform thus remained to them a remote and fanciful panacea, irrelevant to their needs.⁴²

Most recent quantitative studies concerned with ethnic political behavior during the latter half of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century would question much of Jones' interpretation, particularly that immigrants had difficulty "..... accepting, or even grasping, the strange new assumption that politics was a sphere wherein the general good might be realized through common action." Reform, for many ethnic groups, was far from irrelevant and hardly a panacea. In many instances reform was an intrusion on their lives and a cause for "common action" to protect their "general good". Roger Wyman's⁴³ study of Wisconsin ethnic groups and the election of 1890 illustrates this most succinctly.

Wyman's detailed, statistical analysis of the returns for this election, revealed that although the McKinley tariff issue was in part responsible for the loss of thousands of votes by the Republicans, of equal importance, particularly in the eastern section of the state, was the Bennett Law. This supposed reform that required compulsory attendance for every school age child in some public or private day school also insisted that specified areas of the elementary curriculum be taught in English. Viewed as an attack on various ethnic groups and particularly the Germans who maintained their own school system, Wyman discovered that either the tariff or the Bennett Law would have been sufficient for the Republicans to lose the state. As it was, the resulting landslide, intensified by the interaction of the two issues, caused a shift of thousands of German Protestants from the Republican to the Democratic camp and continued to affect elections until 1896.

Frederick Luebke's⁴⁴ study of German voting behavior in Nebraska between 1880 and 1900 discovered similar voting patterns existing there. In general, what he found was that, "... the fewer interpersonal contacts that an immigrant had with members of the host society, the slower was his rate of conformance to its norms and standards. Conversely, if an immigrant had numerous contacts with native Americans, he could be expected to assimilate rapidly."⁴⁵

In testing his hypothesis, Luebke analyzed the biographies of

600 predominantly middle-class persons of German stock. He found that occupation and location of residence (urban or rural) were the least reliable indices of party identification, followed closely by economic factors. The most reliable measure of immigrant voting behavior was found to be church membership. Those immigrants that continued to maintain contact with distinctly ethnic churches tended to be sympathetic to the Democratic Party, while those that attended churches with predominant native-born parishioners tended to lean toward the Republicans. As in Wisconsin, local issues of an ethnocultural nature solidified much of the German vote in the 1890's behind the Democratic Party and continued throughout the decade and into the 20th century.

Paul Kleppner's⁴⁶ social analysis of Midwestern politics between 1850 and 1900 replicates many of Luebke's findings, particularly in regard to the importance of religious affiliation and its effect on political behavior. He concludes that much of the political conflict during the period was the result of pietistic groups of political activists that hoped, through united action, "... to purge society of 'ungodly' acts of behavior, ... eliminate the 'sins' of intemperance and Sabbath desecration and, through the agency of their public schools, to socialize the children of the 'sinners' into a 'righteous' value system."⁴⁷

Opposing the "moral reforms" of the pietists, the ritualists "...distinguished spiritual from secular activities and did not view as sinful those social customs against which the pietists inveighed."⁴⁸ During the 1870's and 1880's, conflicts between the two groups persisted over local and state "reform" issues, with each group using its respective political party as a vehicle to protect its values. What occurred during this period was an increasingly strong Democratic Party and a splintering of the Republican Party into third parties. The condition persisted until the economic traumas of the early 1890's allowed the Republicans to coalesce their power and regain control of the area during the later half of the decade.

Richard Jensen's⁴⁹ study of social and political conflicts in the Midwest during the 1888-1896 period attempts to analyze the political reformulation that Kleppner identified and generally supports Kleppner's findings. Again, Jensen discovered that,

The dominant forces that animated the electorate were

party loyalty and, more fundamentally, religion. ... Only in two grave circumstances did numbers of voters fail to support their traditional party. They did this, first, if the old party grossly disappointed them, usually in an economic crisis. ... The second circumstance ... came when outside loyalties—religious, ethnic or ideological—conflicted with party loyalty.⁵⁰

Since both conditions existed during the period, they provide a valuable matrix for interpreting the political upheavals that ensued.

Finally, John Allswang's⁵¹ study of ethnic politics in Chicago between 1890 and 1936 provides an in-depth analysis of immigrant political behavior over an extended period of time. The immigrant in Chicago during the 1890's, according to Allswang, displayed a political behavior that seems most consistent with Jones' position stated earlier. Most of Chicago's immigrant populace at that time could not vote and "... almost all of [them] were concerned primarily with surviving in a hostile environment ; as such they were a rather passive force and one which politicians tended to take for granted. ..." By 1930, however, these groups had solidified and were able to reshape Chicago politics, nearly irradiating the Republican hold on the city that had existed since the 1890's.

The factors that led to this striking political shift appeared to be concentrated in what Allswang labels the critical period, 1928 to 1932. It was during this period that ethnically attractive and attentive national and local politicians began to appear ; the Democratic Party began to take a positive stand on issues of ethnic concern ; ethnics began to appear on party tickets and receive patronage positions ; local political corruption involving Republican office holders was exposed and the Democratic Party organization solidified and became an efficiently run machine. As Allswang points out, in his conclusion, however,

... an effort to isolate the variables of political behavior must not lead to oversimplification of the complexities of political relationships and the elements of irrationality in political decision-making by individuals and by groups.... Just as the study of political behavior which ignores quantitative tools cannot possibly be complete, so too is a study limited by an

ignoring of the irrational and subjective forces which are always present.⁵³

In the preceding pages an attempt has been made to review some of the more recent studies of immigrants and immigration that have employed quantitative techniques. For the most part, these studies have generally not challenged existing interpretations concerning these areas. The work of Williamson, however, and the spate of recent political studies have presented new questions for investigation in regard to the immigrants' impact on America. Continued studies of this quality should afford the historian a much clearer picture of the importance of immigration in shaping 20th century American life.

FOOTNOTES

1. Maldwyn Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 4-5.
2. Richard A. Easterlin, "Influences in European Overseas Emigration Before World War I," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, IX (3: 1963), pp. 331-351.
3. *Ibid.*, 341.
4. *Ibid.*, 348-49.
5. Maurice Wilkinson, "European Migration to the United States: An Econometric Analysis of Aggregate Labor Supply and Demand," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, LII (3: 1970), 272-279.
6. *Ibid.*, 277.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Lowell E. Gallaway and Richard K. Vedder, "Emigration from the United Kingdom to the United States: 1860-1913," *Journal of Economic History*, XXXI (4: 1971), 885-897.
9. *Ibid.*, 895-896.
10. John Michael Quigley, "An Economic Model of Swedish Emigration," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LXXVI (1: 1972), 111-126.
11. *Ibid.*, 124.
12. *Ibid.*, 123.
13. *Ibid.*, 126.
14. John A. Tomaske, "The Determinants of Intercountry Differences in European Emigration: 1881-1900," *Journal of Economic History*, XXXI (4: 1971), 853 (84 -853).
15. Barry W. Poulson and James Holyfield, Jr., "A Note on European Migration to the United States: A Cross Spectral Analysis," *Explorations in Economic History*, XI (2: 1974), 299-310.

16. Jeffrey G. Williamson, "Migration to the New World: Long Term Influences and Impact," *Explorations in Economic History*, XI (3: 1974), 357-389.
17. *Ibid.*, 377.
18. *Ibid.*, 381.
19. *Ibid.*, 382.
20. *Ibid.*, 384.
21. *Ibid.*, 387-388.
22. Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Immigrant in American History*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 3-29.
23. Jones, *American Immigration*, p. 214.
24. Thomas J. Orsagh and Peter J. Mooney, "A Model for the Dispersion of the Migrant Labor Force and Some Results for the United States, 1880-1920," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, LII (3: 1970), 306-312.
25. *Ibid.*, 311.
26. Lowell E. Gallaway and Richard K. Vedder, "The Increasing Urbanization Thesis—Did 'New Immigrants' to the United States Have a Particular Fondness for Urban Life?" *Explorations in Economic History*, VIII (e: 1971), 305-319.
27. *Ibid.*, 316.
28. Lowell E. Gallaway, Richard K. Vedder, and Vishwa Shukla, "The Distribution of the Immigrant Population in the United States: An Economic Analysis," *Explorations in Economic History*, XI (2: 1974), 213-226.
29. *Ibid.*, 223-224.
30. *Ibid.*, 225.
31. Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted* (New York: Grosset & Dunlop, 1951).
32. Jones, *American Immigration*.
33. Philip Taylor, *The Distant Magnet*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).
34. Handlin, *The Uprooted*, p. 195; Jones, *American Immigration*, p. 313.
35. Robert Higgs, "Race, Skills, and Earnings: American Immigrants in 1909," *Journal of Economic History*, XXXI (2: 1971), 420-428.
36. *Ibid.*, 426.
37. Peter J. Hill, "Relative Skill and Income Levels of Native and Foreign Born Workers in the United States," *Explorations in Economic History*, XII (1: 1975), 47-60.
38. *Ibid.*, 48.
39. Miriam Cohen, "Italian Immigrant Women and Their Daughters," (paper presented at the 5th biennial convention of the American Studies Association, San Antonio, Texas, November 7, 1975).
40. *Ibid.*, 56.
41. *Ibid.*, 60.
42. Jones, *American Immigration*, pp. 314-315.

43. Roger E. Wyman, "Wisconsin Ethnic Groups and the Election of 1890," in *Quantification in American History*, ed. by Robert P. Swierenga (New York : Atheneum, 1970), pp. 239-266.
44. Frederick C. Luebke, *Immigrants and Politics* (Lincoln : University of Nebraska Press, 1969).
45. *Ibid.*, 180.
46. Paul Kleppner, *Cross of Culture* (New York : The Free Press, 1970), pp. 239-266.
47. *Ibid.*, 370.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Richard Jensen, *The Winning of the Midwest* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1971).
50. *Ibid.*, xii-xiv.
51. John M. Allswang, *A House for All Peoples* (Louisville : University Press of Kentucky, 1971).
52. *Ibid.*, 205.
53. *Ibid.*, 210-211.

2

The American Achievement: A Report From Great Ireland

ANDREW M. GREELEY

Somewhere in the Icelandic saga of Eric the Red, that marvelous character (and himself doubtless seven-eighths Irish) sails beyond Iceland and beyond Greenland to a place which he refers to as "Great Ireland," a great land across the sea already inhabited by Irish monks. If we are to take Eric the Red at his word—and, of course, we must—then substantially after the Holy Navigator Brendan and substantially before that "Eyetalian" fella (to use Jimmy Carter's pronunciation) Christopher Columbus there was an Irish settlement somewhere on the North American mainland. Serious scholars will tell you that Great Ireland, if it existed at all, was probably in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia; but those of us who really understand such things know better. Great Ireland was either Queens in New York or Cook County in Illinois.

Let me make it clear before I begin that if I refer to the Irish in North America as "Great Ireland" I intend no qualitative comparisons, only quantitative. There are in Great Ireland 22 million people who claim to be Irish—presumably most of them have some justification for the claim. This is five times as many, give or take a few million, perhaps, as there are on this ancestral isle. As to qualitative matters ... ah well, those of us from Great

Ireland will be very modest indeed. We have a long way to go to catch up with "Little Ireland".

Before I set about my principal task of describing the economic and social achievement of the American Irish and the costs of that achievement, let me clear away the grounds by making some preliminary observations.

First, Bernard Shaw once said that England and the United States were two nations separated by a common language. If I may modify his paradox, Great Ireland and Old Ireland are two nations separated by a common heritage; and if the two Irelands are to understand one another (to say nothing of the other Irelands that have sprung up in England, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and all the other places of the world to which the Irish made pilgrimage), we must be conscious of those things about which we differ.

I am always struck when I get off the plane at Shannon or Dublin that everybody in Ireland looks Irish. It is like I am back home on the south side of Chicago except that the Slavic, Latin, Teuton, and Anglo-Saxon faces are all gone. But each time I must make the mental adjustment to the fact that the people at the airport may look like the crowd that used to come pouring out of Christ the King Church in my neighborhood in Chicago in the 1950s and 1960s, and in many critical respects they are the same kind of people; but they have had different experiences for the last hundred years. If I wish to understand them and they wish to understand me, we must be clear about these different experiences.

The first thing to note is that while there has been a stream of Irish immigration to the United States up to the present, most of the immigration was finished by 1900. Eighty per cent of the Irish Catholic population in the United States are third or fourth generation, which is to say that their grand-parents or their great grandparents were the immigrants. That means that many of our predecessors left Ireland quite unaffected by what I take to be two of the most critical cultural influences that shaped contemporary Ireland, the Celtic revival and the political conflicts that led to the emergence of the Republic of Ireland. My own grandparents, as far as I can calculate, left about the time of the Land League; they were certainly gone before the fall of 'arnell, and knew, for

the most part, only what they read in American newspapers about the political history of Ireland after the turn of the century. What's more, they had their own political and cultural problems in the United States, and while some of my parents' and grandparents' generation may have bothered to be interested in what was going on in the home country, it was an interest from a distance for the most part. More recent Irish immigrants to the United States often complain to me about the low levels of interest among the American Irish in either the Irish literary heritage or (depending on the immigrant's particular cause) the political struggles in the north. My answer to such complaints is that most of us were gone before the Easter Rising, indeed long before the Irish language revival. For us, these events took place in another country; we had more than our hands full in the country that was now our own.

I do not mean, as I hope to demonstrate in this paper, that we have ceased to be Irish, but our experience of the last eighty to one hundred years has not been the same as yours. On both sides of Brendan's ocean, we ought to be clear about that.

Secondly, I will limit my remarks today to that slightly less than half of the Irish-American population that is Catholic. I do so neither to slight the contributions of the so-called Scotch-Irish to American life (more presidents, according to some counts, than other ethnic group, for example); nor do I intend to slight the contributions made by Protestant citizens in the Republic of Ireland. I make my decision for two reasons: first of all, it would appear that most of the Irish Protestant immigration came before 1800, and that this so-called "Scottish-Irish" group had a very different cultural and historical background than the later migrations of "mere Irish", most of whom were Irish Catholic (as still are most of their descendants). Also there is very little literature available about Irish Protestants in the twentieth century. Paradoxically enough, they are a relatively unknown segment of the American population, perhaps in part because they tend to live in southern rural and mountainous districts. To try to talk about these two groups with different cultural backgrounds and different experiences in American life in the same talk would confuse and obscure the issue, I think. So I shall limit myself to the perhaps ten million Irish Catholics in the United States, virtually all of whose ancestors migrated from

what is now the Republic of Ireland (and the Catholic districts of the Six countries) and who came from the late 1840s to the late 1890s for the most part.

Thirdly, there are many different ways to judge the achievements of a people. My concern as a sociologist is not with the individual but with the general population. I do not intend for a minute to deny the achievement of artist, the poet, the tycoon, the general, the entertainer, the athlete, the novelist; my concern as a professional sociologist and as a speaker today is with the ordinary people and their efforts to climb out of poverty and misery, to overcome the obstacles of oppression, bigotry, and fear, and find a new and better life for themselves and their children. To anticipate one of my major theses, the economic and social achievement of the American Irish is one of the most remarkable accomplishments in social history.

My final preliminary remark has to do with terminology. I intend to make use of four "tool words" in stating my theses. A "tool word" can have many different meanings and a writer is free to attach any one of the various available meanings that suit him so long as he is precise about which meaning he is using. A writer has the right to ask his readers to accept the fact that he is using his tool word only in the narrow sense in which he defines it, and presumably the reader will extend to writers the privilege of defining their own terms.

My four terms :

(a) *Population*. By "population" I mean the collectivity of people of whom a given attribute can be predicated without any implication that the members of this collectivity relate to one another in any institutionalized or self-conscious way. When I speak of the Irish-American population, I mean that group of Americans who when asked their nationality background will say "Irish" and when asked their religion will say "Catholic".

(b) *Community*. By "community" I mean a population insofar as it is institutionally organized or psychologically self-conscious.

(c) *Culture*. By "culture" I mean, in this particular paper at any rate, those characteristics of a population on which its members have higher or lower mean scores than do members of other populations on measures such as family structure, the nature of

interpersonal styles, political propensities, attitudes and values (particularly those concerning the ultimate nature of reality), eating and drinking patterns, attitudes toward child-rearing, etc., etc.

(d) *Heritage.* By "heritage" I mean self-conscious culture; that is, a person is aware of his heritage when he realizes that in some respects his culture is different from that of other populations and when he understands and appreciates the most important, most significant, and most excellent creations of his cultural history.

Now, after this all too lengthy preliminary, I am in a position to state my thesis: The Irish population has flourished economically and socially in the United States, but the Irish community is loosely organized, if at all, and only intermittently strong in its self-consciousness. The Irish culture has persisted, indeed sometimes with remarkable tenacity; but self-consciousness about the Irish heritage is almost non-existent. However, because of the survival of an unself-conscious Irish culture, there is always room for a revival of the heritage and some signs that it is in fact reviving.

I shall say little in my remarks today about the institutional organization of the Irish-American community except that it ought to be self-evident that there are no national organizations or journals which speak either for or to more than small segments of the Irish-American population.

First of all, then, the facts of the social and economic achievement of the American Irish. They can be stated rather briefly: the Irish Catholics in the United States are the most successful economically, occupationally, and educationally of any of the Gentile groups in American society. The national average in educational attainment is 11·5 years; for the Irish Catholics it is 12·5 years (one-tenth of a year higher than that of the British Protestants, though less than the Jewish attainment of 14·0 years). On a scale running from zero to one hundred, the national occupational prestige score is 40; the Irish Catholic score is 44, again higher than any other Gentile ethnic group in American society (British Protestant score 43) though less than the Jewish score of 48. In income, Irish Catholic annual family income is \$2473 above the national average—less than the \$3387 above the

national average for Jewish families but substantially more than the \$401 above the average for British Protestants.

Let me fill in with some technical comment for the social scientists who may be lurking in the audience. We are working with a national probability sample of 18,000 respondents, the largest ever used in religio-ethnic research in the United States. The comparisons being made are limited to whites (so the Protestant average is not pulled down by the lower income and educational levels of black Protestants), and we have taken into account the possibility that the concentration of the Irish in cities in the northeast and middle west sections of the country might have given them some disproportionate geographic advantage. Finally, the superior achievement of the Irish in income does not result from the fact that there are more wageearners among the Irish families than in other families.

These data run counter to much of the conventional wisdom about Irish Catholics in the United States; indeed, the data are at variance with the conventional wisdom among many of the Irish themselves. Such distinguished American-Irish commentators as Daniel P. Moynihan and William Shannon have lamented the failure of the American Irish to be economically, socially, and educationally successful. Many of the Irish and non-Irish writers on the subject have evolved all kinds of complex explanations for the economic "failure" of the American Irish, including rigid church control, lower middle-class respectability, and, of course, "the creetur". Many such writers (though scarcely Ambassador Moynihan) have not bothered yet to try to find an explanation for the Irish success which this data suggests. Indeed, not a few of them reject it out of hand. One crypto-Irishman on the Harvard faculty (his name doesn't brand him, although, if you're good at such things, his face surely does) told me that he once attended a Harvard faculty dinner party in which the report containing these findings was ridiculed as being patently absurd.

(Let me simply note here that our findings are unassailable and that no competent specialist in demography would ever expect them to be reversed.)

What's more, it would appear that the Irish success in the United States goes back a long time. Our data enabled us to estimate that college attendance rates for Irish Americans was high

as far back as the First World War. At that time the national average for college attendance of young people of college age was 17 per cent, but one-quarter of the Irish Catholics who came of age in that era went to college; and the national college attendance rate for Irish Catholics has been substantially above the national average ever since. At present a little more than two-fifths of American young people in their twenties have attended college, but three-fifths of the Irish Catholics have, which is an attendance rate approximately that of American Episcopalians.

It is perhaps the misfortune of the American Irish that the group to which they have always been compared is the Jews, whose success in American society has been even more spectacular. But the Jews, while victims of persecution and discrimination in eastern Europe, were a literate, urban, or at least town people; many of them had several generations of background in small commercial activities. The overwhelming majority of the Irish, however, were land-hungry rural proletarians. In the first decades of the immigration, at any rate, the Irish were often illiterate and even non-English speaking or speaking English only as a second language. Comparisons are odious—especially when they are between two groups that have fought, cooperated, competed, and joined hands in a complex relationship in the cities and in the Democratic party of the United States. One can simply say that the Irish have not been as successful as the Jews, but neither has anyone else; and the Irish are more successful than any other Gentile group in the United States. Who would have thought it?

In fact, who believes it?

My second point is that a very heavy price has been paid for this achievement. To detail the nature of this price, let me sketch out very quickly what I take to be four critical components of the Irish heritage—hoping that your reverences will excuse me for drastically oversimplifying.

First, I take it that most of the things that shaped modern Europe did not happen in Ireland. Therefore the line between Irish culture—stories, poetry, language, music, dreams—and the remote past is cleaner, purer, and more direct than it is in most European countries. Ireland was never invaded by the Romans, the Teutons, or Goths. It was far distant from the religious controversies of the early councils of the church; it was relatively

uninfluenced by the Reformation, the Renaissance, the French Revolution, and, until very recently, the Industrial Revolution. The ancient ways survived much longer in Ireland than in any other place in western Europe. For example, it seems that our ancient ancestors had far more extensive vocabularies than we moderns do. They may not have been able to read and write, but they had much richer and more flexible ways of expressing their thoughts to one another. In the modern world this has been lost. The typical human vocabulary for ordinary usage is about 4,000 words; but among the Irish speaking in the west of Ireland, it is 6,000 words, and the closer one gets to the Gaeltak, the more words one has in one's vocabulary. The love affair with words that is part of being Irish, and to a very considerable extent part of being Irish American, represents a direct line to the very ancient and very rich past. That this old Irish culture was worth anything began to be appreciated only with the Celtic revival that began around 1900. I would note again that by that time most of our ancestors had left the country.

My second comment is that Irish politics has rarely been the politics of ideology and issue but of loyalty, friendship, coalition, compromise, consensus (this despite Ireland's history of revolts, which were exceptions). My friend and colleague Professor Emmet Larkin has pointed out that the modern Irish political style grew up in the middle nineteenth century when men like Daniel O'Connell and, later, Parnell combined the Whig skills of the English parliament with west of Ireland clan loyalty. Larkin points out, appropriately, I think, that this was precisely the kind of political style that would prove indispensable in American urban politics. Contrary to popular belief, many of the Famine immigrants came not knowing the language necessarily but knowing politics, which was, in fact, more important.

My third comment is that the Irish Catholic tradition is very ancient, perhaps the oldest in Europe. It is thoroughly Catholic, of course, but also very, very Irish, which makes it also unique and special. (Incidentally, I do not mean by "Irish Catholic tradition" the set of rigid pieties that some people equate with it. As Larkin has pointed out, this is mostly a middle nineteenth-century addition to a much older religious tradition.) In truth we don't know how Ireland was converted; King Leary of Tara was not, after all, converted by Patrick, and one hundred and

fifty years later, his descendant, King Dermot, was still not a Christian. By the time the great missionary saints like Brendan and Columkille set forth to other countries, Ireland was still probably only half Christian. Yet it is the only country in Europe to become Christian without conflict, without martyrs, without compulsion. Slowly, gently, it would seem almost without knowing it, the land became Catholic. As the result of this gradual and gentle change, much that was good and rich and wonderful in pre-Christian Irish paganism was preserved. For example, the Celtic cross was originally a fertility symbol. The monks did not throw it out, they merely used it to represent Jesus and Mary and the reflection of the unity of masculine and feminine in God. We also know that the Brigid cross, which I am wearing today, is an ancient Indo European sun symbol that represents the wheel of the sun moving back and forth across the sky. The pre-Christian goddess Brigid was the goddess of the sun, and the cross was her symbol. Her feast was February 1 and her sacred fire burned in Kildare. Conveniently enough there was also a Christian Brigid, who wears on her religious habit (and on the ancient Celtic brew, be it noted) the sun symbol. The Christian Brigid's feast is February 1 and her monastery just happened to be in Kildare. To make the tie-in with the femininity of God just about perfect, at least some of the early Irish Christians, not completely cured of their pre-Christian past, thought that Brigid might just possibly be the Virgin Mary reincarnate—a nice touch if theologically untenable.

There was a very strong strain of penitential discipline in Irish monasticism. (Many writers today think that its rigors were exaggerated in order to impress the Romans in the controversy over the dating of Easter—and after all, exaggeration is an Irish trait with which we are not unfamiliar. Incidentally, the Irish lost the fight with Rome over the dating of Easter. On historical grounds it is now clear the Irish were right—we usually are, though it's only official when a Roman admits it!) There was also a great love of nature, for color, for human friendship, for argument, and for warm sensuousness (in the good sense of the word). The old pagan stories and tales of people like Deirdre, Maeve, and Finn McCool were not suppressed but lovingly written down in beautifully illustrated and illuminated texts in the same way the Bible was written down. Warmth, beauty, softness, sensi-

tivity to the God that lurked everywhere in nature were and are very much a part of the essence of Irish Catholicism. St. Brigid (or more likely the monkish bard who put the words in her mouth) pictures God as an Irish king come to a great feast that has been prepared for him. She says she would like to have a great pool of ale for the King of Kings, and she would like the heavenly host to be drinking it for all eternity—a religious sentiment that I think would hardly be held inappropriate here at the Cumann Merriman.

Now this poem is very Catholic, and I would suggest that only in the Irish Catholic tradition would anyone be so brave and so daring as to picture God coming to a party and actually enjoying it (much the way Jesus must have enjoyed the marriage feast at Cana). So when I occasionally refer to God as “the Old Fella,” I am doing so right out of the old Irish Catholic tradition.

Another part of the Irish tradition is learning. The Druids may not have had an elaborate written language, but they were passionately interested in understanding how things worked. Their successors the monks were committed scholars as well as holy men. They wrote down all the ancient pagan folk tales and sagas of Ireland and at the same time preserved European culture during the terrible invasions of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. It is no exaggeration to say that had it not been for the Irish monasteries, much of the Greek and Roman learning would have been lost. The modern world might never have come to be.

(Incidentally, no one can read the tales of ancient Ireland that the monks set down and think that the Irish were rigid, narrow puritans. Such characters as Finn McCool, Dermot, Grania, Deirdre, and Maeve were no better than they had to be—and it turns out they didn't have to be very good.)

Let it be noted in winding up this point that now the modern world has suddenly rediscovered the importance of these things I have suggested Ireland has had all along. We are now convinced that in folk song, dance, and story there are rich resources from the past that should not be lost. We are also becoming increasingly convinced once again that neighborhood, freedom of choice, pluralism, and the politics of coalition and consensus are the way free humans ought to govern themselves; that loyalty is saying that after all we do encounter God not merely in abstract

philosophy books, dry catechisms, or tiresome sermons but in the experiences of the warmth and beauty of daily life. Characteristic of all things Irish, we are finally praised when it is almost too late for us to enjoy it.

As I have said, the performance of the American Irish in the social and economic world has been remarkable—and not easy. They said we were too poor, too ignorant, too contentious, too church-ridden, and too often drunk to make it. They pictured us as no better than an ape in a stovepipe hat, clutching a mug of beer in one fist and a shillelagh in the other. They laughed at us, and now we can laugh all the way to the bank and the country club. The host society looked on us as ignorant, dirty, illiterate, intolerable peasants and said we would never be good Americans. They even moved out of the cities and into the suburbs, many of them, to get away from us. Well, we showed them and we showed them good.

One of the reasons for our success was our immense store of political skills. We knew how to put together coalitions, to arrange compromises with which everybody could live even though they made no one completely happy. We did so, I think, usually unself consciously, not realizing that we were engaging in particularly Irish behaviour but just taking it for granted that that was how people acted in the politics of neighborhood, precinct, ward, city, and nation. Similarly, in the ecclesiastical area, despite many disasters past and present, the Irish leadership of the American church, including that great man of Chicago in the first decade of this century, Archbishop James Quigley, held together a coalition of incredibly variegated immigrant groups. And in the case of Quigley, for example, it was done with a style and a pluralistic delight that I'm sure will awe historians for centuries to come.

But even though the Irish political style (about the neighborhood manifestations of which I suspect Professor McCready will have something to say this afternoon) has been immensely successful in holding together urban coalitions, we were never able to articulate a rationale for it. We left the political philosophy and the political science to the "goo-goos" or the "goody-goodies", the reformers, the "better" people, those who thought that government could be run like a corporation, the "rational,"

scientific bureaucratic types who think that politics is about universal principles, abstract issues, and bureaucratic regulations. Now we have permitted ourselves to be ashamed of machine politics, and if we are sufficiently well educated and successful, we rejoice when periodically it is announced that that last of the great urban political machines is dead. (Chicago has a machine, the city is not bankrupt; New York hasn't a machine and is bankrupt.) Our young people at colleges and universities are put through the deracinating experience that university life is supposed to be and frequently end up with hatred and—contempt for a political style and approach (called by my colleague Terry Clark "nonideological particularism") that is the only way to build effective urban coalition governments in America's polyglot, polychrome society. So just now, precisely when neighborhood communities, coalition, decentralization, and affective politics are becoming fashionable among the most advanced and radical, or, alternately, the most thoughtful and perceptive, of American thinkers, we are abandoning a political style that had all these characteristics from the beginning. It is an example of what I call Greeley's Law: When Catholics give something up, other people are just beginning to discover. (Like the Virgin Mary whose praises are now being sung by Protestants while many American Catholics try to pretend that she is not there.)

We still have our love affair with language and many of us still speak poetry without realizing it, but we have pretty much left behind, at least in any self-conscious and explicit way, an appreciation for the Irish cultural heritage. Oh, we may sing songs on St. Patrick's Day (though they are usually Irish-American songs—we haven't heard of the Chieftains, for which God forgive us), but we don't read much poetry and (God forgive us again) we write less of it, and as the greatest storytellers the world has ever known, we don't tell very many any more. Now I'm not making this as a critical comment; I do not see how it could have been any different for us. Perceive what happened: we came to America desperately poor and clearly unwanted; we were told we could never become respectable Americans. All our efforts were bent at proving them wrong, that we could become Americans, successful Americans, and still remain Catholic. It meant we had to give up some of our Irish ways, but, after all, they did not seem to be all that important.

Let me speak of my own family for a moment. Given the time and place my grandparents were born, they were certainly Irish-speakers; they spoke English too, but Irish was their first language. Yet there is only one word in our family memory from that fantastically rich and culturally valuable language, and that is "*amadon*". Obviously, my grandparents made the decision that to become Americans they had to suppress their own language. I remember very clearly riding downtown on a Lake Street "El" with my mother and noticing that the people across the aisle were speaking Italian. She shook her head in dismay, "You really can't be an American," she told me, "unless you speak English." My mother must have heard that from her parents. I think that losing the old language was a heavy price to pay; even if we had no choice, it was still costly. Oddly enough there are now thousands of young people all around the country (including two of my nieces) who are taking courses in the Irish language. There are four hundred students enrolled in such courses at the University of Pittsburgh alone. History has a funny way of doing things.

Or take the matter of names. In my family there are two female names that keep recurring, 'Grace' and 'Jule.' Well, those are certainly not Celtic names. We never could figure out where they came from until I went back to the old country and discovered all kinds of relatives who were 'Granias' and 'Sheilas.' The grandparents must have decided that they even had to Anglicize their names. And then, of course, the common culture played a trick on us and Sheila became perfectly legitimate as a name for Americans— as did Brian, Kevin, Eileen, Sean, Kathleen, Maureen, and even Deirdre. (One of my associates at NORC is named Deirdre, and she's black. You see what I mean about history justifying the Irish in the long run? It reminds me of Mr. Dooley's famous comment that history always vindicates the Democrats but only after they're dead, "f'r nothin' is iver officially true 'til a Repooblic'n admits it, and by th' time a Repooblic'n admits anthin' is true, all th' Dimocrats are long since dead.") I even know people who changed their names from Brigid to Beatrice when they came to this country because they felt that Brigid was too Irish to be "respectable". (To say nothing of those marvelous nicknames, Bridey and Biddy.) The names of the great goddess of light and of the great Irish saint

not respectable enough? Baloney. But that's what many of our ancestors thought. You can't blame them for thinking that way in the circumstances in which they found themselves they had no choice.

Nor is there in Irish-American culture much of the softness, the warmth, the love of nature, the sensuousness, the earthiness that is characteristic of the Irish Catholic tradition at its best. It may be that that part of the tradition is not strong in Ireland just now either, or so it seems to me; but I can tell you that Catholicism in Ireland is less up-tight, more relaxed, and more playful than it is, or at least has been until very recently, in the United States.

Sometimes, just for the sake of making trouble, I tell people (particularly young radicals who are convinced that their generation has developed something new in the way of sexual freedom) that trial marriage, wife swapping, swinging, and equal rights for women is something the Irish invented. I go on to describe the customs of the Brehon laws and some of the practices of the Irish nobility up to at least the time of the Synod of Monnooth. Well, they are shocked. That isn't the way the Irish are or ought to be. Fair enough, but "The midnight Court" is a Catholic poem, and we could do with a lot more of Brian Merriman's attitudes toward sexuality in the church (both in Ireland and the United States) and in the non-Catholic world too. Sex without laughter, Merriman seems to be saying, is also sex without love.

I guess the best way to sum it all up is to say that I don't suppose ninety nine out of one hundred American Irishmen have ever heard of Brian Merriman. I hadn't myself until about five years ago. Such a lack of awareness of something authentic, unique, and remarkable out of one's past is just plain tragic.

On the other hand, and I think this is critically important to my argument, as well as to the future of the American Irish, we have not stopped being Irish. Perhaps the best way to demonstrate this is to point out that my colleague Professor McCready thought to investigate some time ago the extent to which one could be accurate in predicting the scores of various American ethnic groups on a wide variety of attitudes, values and behaviors merely on the basis of what one could derive as hypotheses from the European literature about the cultures from which these

groups came.* McCready's hypotheses were overwhelmingly sustained. Interestingly enough, even though they were relatively early immigrants to American society, the Irish were more distinctive from the British-American mainstream than many of the ethnic groups that came after them. You don't have to realize you are Irish, in other words, to act Irish.

For example, the Irish are the most politically activist group in American society; they are also the most likely to drink and the most likely to have a serious drinking problem; they overchoose journalism and law as professions; their family structure is strong on authority and low on explicit affection and is sharply distinct from that of other American ethnic groups. Their basic world view is the highest of all ethnic collectivities on both fatalism and hope—which is for others a contradiction but for us merely a paradox that makes sense. The Irish are also the American urban ethnic group most likely to visit siblings each week. (Jews and Italians are most likely to visit parents.) They are, despite the adverse publicity given to them in international media, the most socially and politically liberal of Gentile groups in America; and, oh, yes, they are also that group which is best able to cope with the problems of growing old. In other words, in politics, in profession, in basic belief, in drinking, in family life, and in growing old, the American Irish are still distinctively and recognizably Irish. (There is some data that show the Irish are more likely than other American ethnic groups to have frequent sexual intercourse. I don't know whether to believe this or not, and I'll refrain from all judgments about how much they might enjoy it !)

How can culture persist if heritage does not? The answer to that question gets us into one of the most fascinating and fundamental research topics in the study of cultural diversity in the United States. Our tentative answer, however, is that certain basic attitudes, traits, values, and behaviours are transmitted across generational lines in the very early years of life not so much from explicit instruction from parents as from clues provided by

* See William C. McCready, "The Persistence of Ethnic Variation in American Families, Chapter 7, *Ethnicity in the United States* by Andrew M. Greeley (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1974) pp. 156-176; and William C. McCready and Andrew M. Greeley, "The Transmission of Cultural Heritages", in *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, edited by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1975) pp. 209-235.

the subtle interpersonal environment created by the interactions and atmosphere of family life, particularly that atmosphere of intimacy between father and mother. If ethnic characteristics are passed on at early stage of life in such a subtle fashion (and all available evidence indicates that they are), then such characteristics will have remarkable durability and can persist largely undiminished for many generations even without self-conscious intention to transmit such characteristics. Thus, for example, to take two of the most characteristic of American Irish traits, their political activism and their weakness for "the creature", we could find no diminution of this effect either by education, by occupation, or by length of time a family has been in the country; also there was no relationship between Irish self-consciousness and these two effects.

It is precisely the fact that some ethnic traits can be transmitted across generational lines without any self-conscious intent that makes it possible for a heritage to revive. Young Irish Americans are still writing poetry and short stories without any realization, for the most part, of the link between singing and storytelling on the one hand and their past on the other. In fact, the present generation seems more likely to sing and to tell tales than its predecessors perhaps because it feels more free to indulge its literary propensities. Amazingly enough, some of these young people write poems and tales—or so it seems to me—that are quintessentially Irish. I remember one young Irish-American poet to whom I gave a collection of Frank O'Connor's translations of the old poems say to me after devouring the book, "Hey, those people think just like I do!"

As these young people become more and more conscious of the origins of their heritage—and the current ethnic revival in the United States makes this heightened self-consciousness likely—I would suspect that their Irishness will be strengthened and reinforced.

Hence I am more optimistic than people like my friend Professor McCaffrey about the revival of ethnic self-consciousness. I don't say that such a revival will occur; I simply say that the raw material is present for such a revival. If you ask me for my prediction, I will respond with an appropriate mixture of Irish fatalism and hope. For as you know, in any serious Irish conversation two things must be said. First of all, "Ah, they were

great times and great places and marvelous people, but, sure, it's all over, it's done with; they'll not see our like again!"

Then, as the evening wears on and more of the creature is consumed, "Well, sure, there's still some of us around."

So by way of brief summary, we became successful, we kept our political style (though unself-consciously and unexplicitly), but we forgot about or pushed down into our subconscious or unconscious minds the rich memories of our cultural and religious traditions. Yet these traditions still lurk in our personalities because of our early socialization experiences, and they can be recalled and revitalized—with surprising ease, perhaps.

What about the future of the Irish Americans? First of all, I think we should not kid ourselves about the persistence of anti-Irish feeling in American society. In the environments where most of us live and work, it does not exist, but it is powerful indeed in the great universities, the elite national media, the large foundations, and in many of the more intellectual government bureaucracies. Few Irish Catholics are to be found there and they are not wanted—not unless they have apostasized and have turned vigorously against their own heritage and their own people. Neither Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago nor Ambassador Daniel Moynihan would be subject to as much hatred and vituperation as they are if they did not have the "misfortune" to be Irish. Recently, for example, I read two insanely vicious attacks on Pat Moynihan, both quite explicitly explaining that he hates starving little children because he is Irish. In the world of lots of people who do the thinking, writing, interpreting, and funding for American society, the old anti-Irish prejudices are as strong as ever—and usually unconscious. When you ask, "Don't you think it's bigotry to suggest that most Irish politicians are dishonest or that Pat Moynihan is a stage Irish comedian?" the response is likely to be, "But isn't it true that most Irish politicians are corrupt, and isn't it true that Moynihan says most of the things he does for effect? And isn't that the Irish way of doing things? These people may not affect our lives directly, but let me assure you, my friends, they affect the world in which we live and in which our children grow up.

Incidentally, on the subject of Richard J. Daley ... I have been asked repeatedly by Irish journalists and intellectuals how

the Irish Americans ever managed to be captured by such a reactionary fascist. My standard response is that I didn't know Irish journalists and intellectuals judged a political leader by what they read about him in a half-column article in *Time* magazine. Like all political leaders Daley made his mistakes; he was still, by almost universal agreement, the best municipal administrator in America. Every time he ran for office he was reelected not by the Irish but by the blacks and the Poles, capturing 80 per cent of the vote from those two very different ethnic groups. In the last election, Daley polled 65 per cent of the Jewish vote against a Jewish opponent. No man who is either a reactionary or a fascist could possibly do that. Daley was a very astute, skillful, and sensitive Irish politician— perhaps the best in the twentieth century. It is a measure of the pervasive influence of anti-Irish feelings in the elite sectors of American life that Daley's image in the world press is what it is.

But the anti-Irish feelings ought to be no effective barrier to us. In the final analysis, what comes of the American Irish is something that is up to them. I am sure that there are three or four extremely wealthy Irish millionaires in this audience who will dash up to me after my presentation, checkbook in hand, and ask me what they can do to revitalize the Irish-American community and Irish-American self-consciousness. Let me tell you what I think.

The future challenge for Irish Americans will be to recover the spirit of scholarship and learning that is part of our heritage. We are well educated— indeed, the best educated Gentile group in American society— but we are thin on scholarship and learning. While we have produced writers like O'Neil and Farrell, O'Connor and Power, they have been alienated from, one might say even pushed, out of the Irish-American community. Let me illustrate what I mean by pointing to the unbelievably brilliant and beautiful book, *World of Our Fathers* by Irving Howe, a book about the New York Jews. No one could write such a book about the Irish-American experience. And it is not that we do not have writers as skilled as Howe, though he is indeed a superlative writer, but because an Irish Catholic Irving Howe would not have available the scholarly and literary resources with which to work. Our Jewish brothers have produced a fantastic amount of scholarly research and literary publications describing their experience in

this country. There are Jewish research centers, Jewish studies programs, Jewish endowed chairs at universities, Jewish scholarly conferences, Jewish literary prizes, Jewish artistic and literary commissions. Even though we are only slightly behind them in income, we have little if any comparable resources for culture study. We cannot talk about our politics, we cannot recapture our experience in either Ireland or America; we cannot rediscover the roots of our own immense cultural heritage without such resources. I am not suggesting that we are inferior to the Jews because they have done it and we have not; I am simply pointing out that we have had different histories in the U. S. A. and that now we are beginning to enter an era, I think, when the institutes, the research centers, the funded chairs in Irish or Irish-American studies, the literary prizes, the historical competitions could be as useful a part of Irish-American life as their like are to Jewish-American life. It would be an effective way to refute the bigots and an even more effective way to equip our young people to realize how rich a resource their own tradition is as they begin to enter the worlds of the foundation, the national media, and the university.

There is one very strong response that might be made to this plea of mine for a rediscovery of Irish scholarship and learning, as well as the encouragement of literary and poetic activities. And that is, who needs it? Who cares what they think about us? Who cares what others say? Let the Jews have their novels, their poetry, their magazines, and their chairs of Jewish studies. Why should we be bothered?

It is an arguable position. However, it seems to me that there are two weaknesses to it. First, we cheat our fellow Americans that way. There is much in the Irish tradition of politics, culture, and religion that responds to the needs and desires contemporary humans are feeling again—for a warm religion of emotion, the politics of neighborhood, coalition, and loyalty, and for a culture that reaches far into the past and deep into the roots of the human personality. We have that from our tradition—however much we have forgotten it; it would be a shame not to share it with others.

But there is a more important reason, I think, why we should recapture our tradition of scholarship and learning. It is the

Irish thing to do. Granted that we first had to establish ourselves in this country, granted that much of our education was practical and pragmatic; but now we have made it, and not to be interested in scholarship and learning, not to try to rediscover and share with others the riches of our past would be a horrendously un-Irish way to act. How dare we say that ideas, history, and learning are unimportant, we whose ancestors kept alive the light of civilization for Europe through the Dark Ages? How dare we not respect poetry and storytelling among our own kind, we whose predecessors were the finest poets and the greatest storytellers in the history of the human condition? That we had not the time or the resources to do it until now is understandable; but, God forgive us—and I fear Brigid, Patrick, Columkille, Brendan, and all the rest will not—if we turn aside now from the scholarly dimensions of our own tradition.

Let me be blunt about it. For a people whose past is filled with writers, storytellers, poets, and scholars, we have produced in America very few of any of these and have encouraged even fewer. In truth, and again, heaven forgive us for it, we have often discouraged those who wished to pursue learning and culture. And too often it was not merely what one wrote—since what one wrote was rarely read—but the mere fact of writing was sufficient to make people suspicious of one of their own who dared to pursue the literary arts. (And if this sounds like a comment on personal experience, let me assure you that it is.) We did not even have to read our own writers to know we didn't like them.

Well, the past is the past, and it had its own reasons, which we must try hard to understand sympathetically. We are still Irish. We are not Irish like our relatives in Ireland are, because for several generations now we have had different experiences. But we are in love with language, we dream great dreams, we are masters of politics, we are paradoxically hopeful fatalists, and we tend to drink too much. We are still Irish. We are the heirs to one of the richest religious, cultural, scholarly, and political traditions of human history. It is time we learned more about it, time for us to understand it better, time for us to give more self-conscious thoughts to who we are and where we came from. It is time we shared our rich resources with our fellow Americans.

By way of conclusion, let me do a fairly Irish thing and quote three poems, one written by an Irish-American woman, one by a fourteen year-old boy, and one, oddly enough, by me.

A MINSTREL CALLING

Once I tripped over a piece of music and never been the same,
 Can't remember exactly when nor even know the name.
 It may have been in Church one morn,
 Or it may have been in carnegie hall,
 But it matters not at all for the call still spoke my name.
 Come, it said— come to my feast, put furrowed brow aside,
 There's always time for peace dear friend, but now's a holy war
 War against the yawn— my boy,
 We need heroes and some clowns.
 You laugh but ever was a fiend,
 More dread than a puffed up frown ?
 Takin' itself so serious, you'd think the godhead had passed on,
 That there was no reason for the dance, no purpose to the song.
 Ah, the world is filled with mischief, it's a tease to men like ye,
 To make you throw your hands up, in a gesture if you please.
 To say there's not a hope on earth of things ever working out,
 That fear and worry carried the day, and death won out,
 no doubt.
 But the music plays forever, for those with ears to hear,
 And the stone keeps rolling back again, for over a thousand
 years.
 So listen friend, come now it said,
 Don't waste time to clear the shelf.
 Hold the flute in earnest now,
 You might just trip another dolt yourself.

Nancy Gallagher McCready
 May 14, 1976

WHERE IS THE LIGHT?

Where is the light ?

Has it left our minds and tragically left the candle
 Which ignites our love
 That we forever base our life on.

Where is the light ?

Is it just aware of that solemn glare
 And decided to leave the presence.

Where is the light ?

Has it left our minds to disappointively find
Our passion, bluer than ever.

Where is the light ?

Has it met its match in the tunnel below
Where light can't shine and goom can glow.

Is this tunnel too thick for the light to shine ?
I see the tunnel. I see the light !

George Connelly
April 21, 1976

DEDICATION

At morning's first misty light
They came out of the primal bogs
And worshiped in the holy woods.
They tended the sacred fire
And sang of the land of promise
beyond the seas in the fabled west.

They told tales of heroines and gods
Sad Deirdre, mighty Finn
Noble Dermot, frenzied Maeve.
Then Podraig—
And soft as summer rain
A new and loving god
came gently to their dreams.

Ah, great men they were and women too
But it's all over, 'tis the end.
We shall not see their like again.

Bards and monks, scholars and saints
Bishops and kings, hermits and pilgrims
They printed the books and taught the schools
and claimed they prayed the whole night long.
By the smoking peat the learned scholar
With weary eye and bobbing head read his sacred text;
And zealous Pangar Ban pursued the local mice
While Holy Brigid kept a great pool of ale
for the welcoming of the King of Kings.

Doubtless brave and a little mad
They lit the lamps of Europe
Conquered the conquering Dane
and then lit the lamps again
While Holy Brendan sailed to the land of promise in the west.

Insula sanctorum ? Not always.
Still, great men they were ... and women too
But it's all over, 'tis the end.
We shall not see their like again.

Through rocky fields they walked, down the muddy lanes
Past the empty cottage and by the youthful corpse
On to the leaky ships, across the mountain sea.
Sick, hungry, poor, afraid.

Into the slum, the tavern, the gutter
The mill, slaughterhouse, the early tomb.
Like Holy Brendan they sailed to the land of promise in the west
and found hatred, misery, and sudden death.

Oh, yes, great men they were—and women too
But it's all over, 'tis the end.
We shall not see their like again.

Out of their neighborhoods they climbed
Onto "the cars," into "the force"
Teacher and priest, mayor and doctor
Lawyer and crook, nun and nurse
They sang, they danced, they talked the whole night long.
They cried at births, they laughed at wakes.
They drank, they talked, they fought
and then they talked again.
And on dark gray autumn afternoons
they prayed for the triumph of Notre Dame.

Indeed great men they were—and women too
But it's all over, 'tis the end.
We shall not see their like again.

So it is all over now.
And tears flow at the country club
For all the glories that were
And all the greatness that might have been.
We made it at last in the land of promise
And damn proud we are.
We showed them. We won ; we got in.

It is the end of our tale
But what does it matter ?
We glow briefly in the sun's lingering flame
As, martini glass in hand, for the final time
we pray for the triumph of Notre Dame.

Ah, great men we are—and women too
But it's all over, 'tis the end.
They shall not see our like again.

So lean thinker and towering poet
What are you two doing here ?
Have you not heard my sad refrain ?
The tale is told, 'Tis over, finished, done.
Join the others at the wake

and sing and drink to the end of it all.

Poet and wise man, druid and monk
Migrant and rebel, monsignor and cop
All dead and buried in the ground.

Today in the land of promise, can it be ? Is it true ?
Are there still some of us around ?
Are there stories yet to be told ?
A few mysteries still to be probed ?
Songs to be sung, work to be done
in the melting pot that didn't melt ?
Not yet curtains for the crazy celt ?

So, generous teachers and loyal friends,
The sun still rises over the misty bogs,
Not all that far from Scarsdale to Mayo
or from Kerry to Oak Park.

Let it then be writ on the morning sky :

God help them all
But it is not the end.
They shall indeed see our like again.

Andrew M. Greeley
June 21, 1976

3

The Italian Americans: A Bicentennial Perspective

RUDOLPH J. VECOLI

"Accidenti al'America e a quel Colombo che l'ha scoperta, (Curse America and that Columbus who discovered her). As I was growing up in Connecticut, I heard this expression frequently on the lips of my mother and our *paesani*. Said in moments of frustration, of homesickness, of anger, this imprecation expressed a judgment about the experience of immigration, a judgement made by the immigrants themselves. I take this then as a motif of the history of the Italians in America.

During this Bicentennial year, it may seem inappropriate to dwell upon the less happy aspects of the Italian American experience. After all this is a celebration— isn't it? Should we not speak of Colombo and Vespucci? of Mazzei and Beltrami? of Meucci and Fermi? of Sinatra and Dimaggio? Or perhaps we should extoll the glories of the *rinascimento*, of Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Galileo. Should we not catalogue the contributions of the Italian genius to American culture—to its art, its music, its architecture? It would be so easy to indulge in such puffery, and it would be so pleasing to the ears of my audience. After all we all enjoy flattery and what harm would a little pat on the back do? My basic objection to self-congratulatory "history" is that it is a counterfeit, it falsifies, indeed denies the real story

of the Italian Americans. Rather than history, it is a kind of mythology which obscures rather than clarifies the experience of the Italian immigrants. By doing so it makes it more difficult for those of us who are Italian Americans to know and to accept our authentic past.

We—and American society as a whole—in my judgement are deficient in self-knowledge, in part because while all human history contains pain, suffering, and defeat, the history of these United States has been told as a triumphal procession towards unlimited progress and happiness; to suggest that it has been something less seems almost unpatriotic. We, Italian Americans (as has been true for other ethnic groups) have simply tried to make our history conform to that national success story. But it seems that after the traumas of the 1960s, political assassinations, domestic violence, Vietnam, and Watergate, we are all sadder and wiser. The mood of this Bicentennial Year is far from the spirit of self-satisfied nationalism of 1876; rather we are in a skeptical mood of self-scrutiny. The history of the Italian Americans should be approached in the same spirit. What follows are my reflections on that history, personal reflections, informed by my experience as the son of Italian immigrant parents as well as by study. Another person would probably see things differently.

The most tragic aspect of the immigration probably was the way it divided immigrant parents from American born children. In the schools and on the streets, the children learned more quickly than their fathers and mothers the English language and American ways. They also learned to be ashamed of the old country manners, the speech, the very appearance of their green-horn parents. I remember at a certain age how I hated to go downtown with my mother; perhaps my schoolmates would see me with her; they would know I was different, an Italian and not an American. I would always lag behind a few steps and pretend to be by myself. And I remember the shame of having to go to the townhall to serve as an interpreter for my father. Now we know how universal this feeling was among the children of immigrants, generated by the pressures of American culture which deemed anything foreign as inferior and contemptible. With their keen instinct for survival, children learned quickly that to be Italian or Polish or Greek was to be bad, to be American was to be good. And how we ached to be American! When we

come to contemplate our autobiographies as adults, and our collective histories, we must deal with those feelings of inferiority which were inculcated in us by our teachers (well-meaning Yankee ladies and Irish nuns who wished to make us into good little Americans). So when we discuss Italian American history, we would rather speak of Giuseppe Verrazzano and William Paca than of our parents ; yet it is *they* who are the main protagonists of that history. Of course, this type of filiopietism (itself a misnomer since it stems from a rejection of, not reverence for, one's ancestry) is not peculiar to Italian Americans ; it has been characteristic of all ethnic groups which have been stigmatized as inferior by the dominant Anglo-American society. Since we could not identify with John Winthrop, Nathan Hale, George Washington, Robert E. Lee, etc., we had to find our own ethnic heroes to demonstrate that we too had played a role in American history, *i. e.*, that we had as good a claim to being good Americans as they— except we didn't believe it.

A very healthy recent development in my judgement is our new perception of the United States as a pluralistic society. The "new ethnicity" movement rests upon the basic tenet that no one ethnic group, no one cultural tradition, no one history, should dominate this country ; it also rejects the "Melting Pot" ideal in which all groups and cultures are to be assimilated into an American type. Rather we are coming to perceive and appreciate the way in which ethnic diversity can enrich the lives of all of us ; rather than being a source of shame and stigma, differences are being affirmed as a source of pride and identity. What a wonderful thing that in our lifetimes, groups long oppressed by a sense of self-hatred and inferiority have been able to assert that "Black is Beautiful," "Polish is Beautiful," "Italian is Beautiful." *Of course, they all are*, and this is the glory and beauty of America.

This ethnic renaissance, this rediscovery of the richness of America's multiple cultures constitutes a cultural revolution, a quiet, nonviolent (for the most part) revolution, which will have an enormous liberating effect upon future generations of Americans. Imagine an America where no one need feel ashamed or rejected because of his skin color, nose shape, the sound of his name, the food he eats, or the religion he practises— and where **no one will be subjected to the cruelty of so-called ethnic jokes.**

We know that a child who accepts himself, who enjoys self-esteem, has the best chance of becoming an effective, mature adult. We also know that the child who has a positive identification with his own family history and cultural traditions is most likely to develop an integrated, positive self-identity. The study of the history of the Italian Americans or any other ethnic group therefore becomes much more than an academic enterprise ; it is for the members of that group an adventure in self-discovery and self-understanding, a path to greater maturity. But the study of these various ethnic histories must not be limited exclusively to group members ; indeed we need to know the stories of other groups in order to better understand our own and to comprehend the manner in which the total American pluralistic society has evolved. Thus we do not approach the history of the Italian Americans in a spirit of ethnocentricity ; we are not intent on proving that "we" are better than anyone else ; we know that all groups, including ours, has an equal place in this American mosaic.

What then can we say about the history of the Italians in America in the few pages allotted to us ? First, we should recognize that this is a vast and complex subject, one which would require a library of books to describe adequately, books most of which have not as yet been written. Consider the magnitude of the Italian immigration ; over five million men, women, and children have come to this country over the past 150 years, two thirds of them in the first two decades of this century. At the high point, 1907, almost 300,000 arrived in one year. A virtual tidalwave of humanity swept upon the American shore. Who were these newcomers whose faces, apprehensive, frightened, determined, look out at us from the photographs taken at Ellis Island ? "America, the land that gathers the rebels, the miserable, the very poor," declared Emanuel Carnevali, himself an immigrant at age 16. Certainly it is true that for the entire history of European immigration, it was not the upper classes, the nobility, the wealthy, who emigrated ; rather those who came were seeking a better life. The great majority of the Italians were *artigiani* and *contadini*, working people, attracted by America *la terra del dollaro* ; here they hoped to earn higher wages, often to return to their *paese*. They came from all regions of Italy. Among the first were the *figurinai*, who made statues of plaster,

from Lucca and fruit peddlers from Liguria, stone workers from Friuli and barbers from Sicily, masons from Lombardy and tailors from Campania, and *contadini* (peasants), from all over, but especially from the poor regions of the South. Initially the men came, only later after they had decided to remain did they send for wives, daughters, and sweethearts. Following the old adage, "*Moglie e buoi da paesi suoi*" (Wives and cattle from your own towns); they preferred to send back for their brides rather than marry American girls. "*L'America, donne senza colore e frutta senza sapore,*" (America, women without color and fruit without taste), they said. Most striking was the youthful age of the immigrants, mostly between 15 and 30; and not a few boys emigrated alone at ages of 14 or younger. Certainly emigration was undertaken in the spirit of adventure but it was basically motivated by economic need, a growing population, inadequate exhausted land, high taxes; all these sent the young people abroad in search of *pane e lavoro* (bread and work). In thinking about the immigrants then we must see them as full of life and spirit, capable of prodigious of work, willing to submit to untold hardships in order to fulfill their mission, to save a few hundred dollars so as to return to the *paese* to buy land, pay off the mortgage, provide a dowry for a sister, or an education for a son. And many, almost half, did return; some having achieved their goals, others defeated, mutilated in industrial accidents, ill with tuberculosis. Observers remarked on how a few years in America wore out of these vigorous young people. Because in truth, they found in America *una vita dura*.

Italians were welcome in America for a time, because they were needed by American industry. Emma Lazarus's lines on the base of the Statue of Liberty, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempesttost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door," had they been able to read them, would have brought a cynical smile to the faces of the Italian immigrants. America was for them not a refuge, an asylum, rather it was a place to work—and work they did incessantly. On the railroads and the subways, in the mines, and the steel mills, in the sweat-shops of the garment industry and textile factories, they worked—sometimes 12 hours or more a day, six or even 7 days a week, for wages of \$1.50 or \$2.00 a day.

Exploited? Of course, they were exploited. Yet they usually submitted because of their determination to earn the sacred American dollar, or because they had no choice, ignorant of the language and the customs, often at the mercy of a countryman who acted as the padrone—boss. Then they rebelled, as in Lawrence, Massachusetts in 1912, Paterson, New Jersey in 1913, the Mesabi range in 1916. As a result the Italians earned a reputation as docile workers for which they were hated by American labor; and a reputation as violent anarchists for which they were feared by American employers.

Among the many different nationalities in America, few have encountered more hostility and prejudice than the Italians. They were denounced as wagecutters by organized labor, as radicals by business, as inferior breeds by the scientists of the day, "beaten men of beaten races" in the words of future president Woodrow Wilson, as bloodthirsty criminals adept in the use of the stiletto. Italians were victims of physical assaults in the streets by gangs, on the job by other workers. In the southern and western states, quite a number were lynched by mobs. The Italians were not even welcome in the Catholic Churches, since they were viewed by the American (Irish) Catholics as little better than pagans. Many residential neighborhoods were closed to Italians until recent decades, as were social clubs, and high status occupations. This story of systematic discrimination to which the Italians were (and to some extent still are) subjected is yet to be told. Once American industry decided it no longer needed the "Dago" ditch diggers, the immigration restriction laws of the 1920s almost entirely excluded them. The Italians as "undesirables" were limited to a quota of 5,802 a year by the law of 1924. The quota system which was based on explicitly racist assumptions remained in effect until 1965. Of course, the effect of this policy was to severely limit the number of Italian immigrants.

I have touched upon these painful and negative aspects of the history of the Italian Americans not to stir up bitter memories, but to remind us that these are fundamental qualities of that history. Any discussion which omits them falsifies that history. If we are to be true to the memory of our immigrant ancestors, we must also remember what they suffered and endured. Hopefully, this will make us more sensitive to and sympathetic with those who continue to be exploited and despised. One of the

dangers of achieving some success, upward social mobility as the sociologists call it, is that we tend to forget, even reject our humble social origins. To do so, in my opinion, is to cut ourselves off from a source of inspiration and direction. At least for me, as I think of my father, a construction laborer, and my mother, sometime seamstress and laundry-woman, I find their example of fortitude, determination, and resourcefulness, a valuable heritage which I hope my children will know and cherish.

But to dwell on suffering and hardship would also be a distortion of the Italian immigrant experience, because there was also much joy and satisfaction. Most of the immigrants accepted the harsh realities and made the best of them. In their tenement rooms or company houses, they created homes for their families alive with love and beauty. Once families were established they served as the focus for social and cultural life. Domesticity may be the highest art perfected by the Italians; everything revolved about the household and the family. In so far as possible the way of life of the *paese* was maintained, for the immigrants took to heart the proverb: "*Chi lascia la via vecchia per la nuova, sa quel che perde ma non sa quel che trova.*" (He who leaves the old way for the new knows what he is losing, but not what he will find.) In the intervals between work and in the household routines, the husband and wife then found the traditional satisfactions; the cultivation of a vegetable garden, the making of *Pasta*, the glorious season of winemaking, the family meals together, the gatherings with *paesani* and relatives, the holidays of *pasqua* and *Natale*, the feastdays of the patron saints. Here in this round of life, our parents created a world of meaning to which they could withdraw from the confusion and harshness of the factory and the city. In short, the Italian immigrants, although often semi-literate peasants brought with them a humanistic way of life, a sense of measure, of order, of morality, which they maintained despite the pressures of modern society. In retrospect, we can see that this was no small accomplishment, and although as children we may not have fully appreciated the discipline and the restraints, we now see more clearly the need for such a domestic culture as essential to a civilized life. Of course, our immigrant parents were not paragons or saints; there were domestic conflicts aplenty. Some families functioned more lovingly than others, but beneath it all

there was a sense of order, of proper relationships between husband and wife, between parents and children. Thus, the family was the major strength of the Italian immigrants as they made their way in a strange, often hostile, environment. Within the family were cultivated the love of food, music, and sociability, which gave to Italian American life its distinctive quality.

Of course, times have changed since those days of half a century ago, more or less, when "Little Italies" were being established in cities all over the country. The immigrant generation is slowly passing from the scene; the average age of the survivors is now in the eighties. The second generation, the American born children, are now middle-aged or beyond often with grown children who constitute the third generation. Altogether the three generations may number some ten million Italian Americans. To attempt to describe this population today is indeed a hazardous business. Italian Americans are scattered all over the country and at all levels of the social structure. Certainly as was to be expected a great deal of assimilation has taken place. *La via vecchia* has in fact been abandoned for *la via nuova*, to a greater or lesser degree, by the second and third generations. This reflects, of course, the upward social mobility reflected in higher levels of educational achievement, of professional and managerial occupations, and in higher income levels. According to a recent study by Andrew Greeley, Italian Americans rank higher in income than any Protestant group. This may be a reason for self-congratulation considering the point of departure from a position among the lowliest and least regarded element in the working class. To observe that the children and grandchildren of the *contadini* have become professionals, managers, and technicians is a tribute to the open-class system of American society (in fact the promise of American turned out not to be a fraud for the second and third generations), but it is even more a tribute to the immigrant generation which provided the base, moral as well as economic, from which their descendants could move upward. It was the immigrants who spent a lifetime carrying a hod, as did my father, or mining coal, or mending shoes, who paid the costs of our progress; if we have been able to realize some success it is because of their sacrifices.

With upward social mobility have come other cultural changes; the old neighborhoods have largely been deserted for

more comfortable, suburban districts. In part this has been due to the bulldozing of those areas to make way for freeways, public housing, and new commercial developments. Certainly urban renewal and housing policies have hastened the demise of the "Little Italies". Of course, they are not all gone; one can still find compact Italian neighborhoods on the West Side of Chicago and the North End of Boston, in Brooklyn, South Philadelphia, and elsewhere. Now we find a new concern to sustain these ethnic communities which are at last recognized as sources of stability and vitality which are so urgently needed in our cities. Although only a minority of the Italian American population forms part of ethnic residential communities, does this mean that the majority have become completely assimilated and no longer participate in a meaningful way in an Italian American culture? Quite the contrary, it appears that thanks to the automobile and the telephone it is possible to maintain membership in an ethnic community without living in a compact settlement. Through various societies and associations, cultural clubs, and religious institutions, many Italian Americans retain an active sense of ethnic identity and participation. Whereas in the past such affiliations were usually defined along regional or local lines, such as the *societa di mutuo soccorso* of the *paesani*, now it tends to reflect the social class differentiation among Italian Americans. The old exclusiveness of *companilismo* appears to have been replaced by class distinctions. But the substance of these associations, whether it be politics, culture or religion, seem often to have more to do with America than with Italy, and this is probably as it should be.

Although the maintenance of *la via vecchia* would have been possible only by complete separation from American society as is practised by the Hutterites, the transition to *la via nuova* is for many Italian Americans far from complete—and many of us are now questioning whether it is completely desirable. The headlong rush toward total Americanization (whatever that might mean) which was characteristic of many of the second generation during the 1930s and '40s is no longer typical of Italian Americans. Rather more and more we are asking what is it that we are losing? what are we surrendering? what price assimilation? As we review the options offered by our market economy for cultural goods and services, *la via vecchia*, at least in certain respects,

looks better and better. American white bread sticks in our throats; we yearn for the crusty *pane* that crunches under the teeth; we think of the lost art of home winemaking and seek to revive it; but more important than the things of the stomach, we seek nourishment for the spirit (although for the Italian the two are closely related). We know now the value of that network of *famiglia* and *paesani*, but once it has been rent can it be mended? of the warmth and security of relationships which are not functional or contingent, but are as secure as the elements of nature. As we see our children adrift in a normless society, we stand in awe of our immigrant ancestors who had such a firm grip on themselves and on reality. One cannot help feel that Americanization meant among other things filling the head with illusions and delusions. Can we recapture for ourselves and for our children that sure sense of self, that clear-eyed view of the world? In short, it seems to me that many of my generation are seeking a *via media* (another Italian quality). Unable to return to *la via vecchia*, unwilling to embrace entirely *la via nuova*, we seek to find firm ground somewhere in the middle. Is it possible?

While individually we work out our particular answers to that question, collectively as Italian Americans we have certain responsibilities to fulfill. Collective action has never been a forte of the Italians, either in Italy or America. Here as there for too long the ancient prejudices of regionalism have obstructed the development of community, and the lack of unity has certainly hindered the collective progress of the Italian Americans. Realizing this, we have looked to the Jews and more recently the blacks as models of ethnic solidarity (little realizing the internal divisions within those groups). Recently there is evidence that in the second and particularly the third generations, such internal differences are being increasingly surmounted, and the possibility for cooperation is being realized. What then should be our common objectives?

Perhaps because I am an historian, I would place the cultivation of Italian American history high on the list of priorities; I also happen to agree with Ole Rolvagg, the Norwegian American novelist, who asserted: "If a man is to realise in full measure the potentialities of his own being, he must first of all learn to know his own people's history and literature." We need to preserve and study the history of our immigrant ancestors, not

out of a spirit of reverence, but in order to understand that experience which has contributed so largely to making us what we are. That history as I have indicated is vast indeed; it includes literally millions of individual stories, many of which I am sure deviate sharply from the general experience outlined above. Most of those stories are now beyond our reach, although there may be some records, letters, diaries, photographs, which have captured bits and pieces of them; these should be preserved. But of those survivors who are still with us we should take full advantage recording their memories which are a part of our heritage. Oral history as historians call it is not a mysterious process. With a limited amount of training, anyone can become a recorder of valuable historical information. Certainly it should be a community project and not restricted to professional historians. Advice and guidance can be provided by the American Italian Historical Association, an organization of some 300 members, both lay persons and scholars.

9537

It is also logical to assume that those of us who identify as Italian Americans tend to be more interested in the fortunes of Italy than other Americans. Certainly we have relatives there with whom we correspond or whom we visit on occasion. We also tour the peninsula and island and often develop an interest in the history and culture of the country. Thus when adversity strikes the Italian people, we identify more perhaps than others do with the victims. It is only natural that after the recent earthquakes in Friuli Italian Americans should take the initiative to provide relief to the bereaved and the homeless. Most Italian Americans do not follow Italian politics closely, a difficult task in any case, and as compared with certain other ethnic groups, they are less involved with such political conflicts in the country of origin. The recent elections posed a dilemma for Italian Americans. While the entry of the Communists into the Italian government is certainly an issue to be debated with pros and cons, the instinctive anti-Communist reaction of many Italian Americans appears to be rather mindless. But it was most offensive to have a discredited political hack such as John Connally, presuming to be the spokesman for democracy in Italy, as chairman of the Citizens Alliance for Mediterranean Freedom. Connally indulged in an extraordinary display of presumption and stupidity; but unfortunately a number of prominent Italian Americans followed themselves to

be taken in by his anti-communist game. Where are the Italian Americans willing to stand up and say it is time for the CIA and the USA and the John Connallys to stop meddling in Italian affairs?

If there is an Italian American culture, as I believe there is, it should also be a concern of our ethnic community to support and nourish that culture. One of the most impressive developments in recent years has been the flowering of Italian American talent in the arts. Creative artists for the first time are drawing upon their Italian heritage for themes and forms. One need mention only Francis Ford Coppola and Martin Scorsese in films; Mario Puzo and Gay Talese in literature; Gregory Corso and Lawrence Ferlinghetti in poetry; Frank Stella and Mark Di Suvero in painting and sculpture; and Dominick Argento in opera. The Italian American community should recognize and encourage such creative artists more than it has in the past. It should celebrate such artistic achievements as well as the heroes of popular culture. It should also do much more to encourage the teaching of Italian language, literature, and culture, from the grade school level to the university.

We are entering a new stage in the continuing evolution of an Italian American identity and an Italian American community. If I were to make a prediction, I think we are on the verge of an era of unity and creativity in which the Italian influence will permeate American society. The basis for this new age of Italian American emergence will be a cooperative relationship between the Italian American community and the Italian American artists and academics. This will be a fitting and long cherished memorial to those immigrant ancestors who laid the basis for these accomplishments through their sacrifices and sufferings. Then perhaps the ancient curse, "*Accidenti al'America e a quel Colombo che l'ha scoperta,*" will be laid to rest.

4

Carpatho-Ruthenian Resources and Assimilation, 1880-1924 : A Preliminary Survey*

RICHARD RENOFF

Even in this era of heightened ethnic awareness and pluralism most Americans are probably unaware of the existence of the tiny Carpatho-Ruthenian group which was part of the 1880-1924 "new immigration" to the new world.¹ The ancestors of these Slavic-Americans inhabited the southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains in pre-World War One Northern Hungary (present-day Eastern Czechoslovakia and Western Ukraine), where they had lived since the fourteenth century or earlier.² Although a thorough exposition of their distinguishing characteristics is beyond the scope of this paper, their unfamiliarity produces a necessity for more description than such highly familiar and larger groups of the "new immigration" such as Italians, Poles, and Russian Jews.

Major reasons for the unfamiliarity of these people are the absence of a distinct national consciousness among their European peasants and day-laborers and the varying identifications chosen by their intelligentsia in Europe and America. A peasant might only identify himself or herself as a resident of a local area such as a county, valley, or village and would be so provincial that he or she lacked a consciousness of the existence of culturally similar people living a short distance away. To this day, many descendants of these immigrants not infrequently identify their group as

*This paper is a greatly revised version of an address delivered at Mt. St Macrina, Uniontown, Pennsylvania, 11 August 1975.

be taken in by his anti-communist game. Where are the Italian Americans willing to stand up and say it is time for the CIA and the USA and the John Connallys to stop meddling in Italian affairs?

If there is an Italian American culture, as I believe there is, it should also be a concern of our ethnic community to support and nourish that culture. One of the most impressive developments in recent years has been the flowering of Italian American talent in the arts. Creative artists for the first time are drawing upon their Italian heritage for themes and forms. One need mention only Francis Ford Coppola and Martin Scorsese in films; Mario Puzo and Gay Talese in literature; Gregory Corso and Lawrence Ferlinghetti in poetry; Frank Stella and Mark Di Suvero in painting and sculpture; and Dominick Argento in opera. The Italian American community should recognize and encourage such creative artists more than it has in the past. It should celebrate such artistic achievements as well as the heroes of popular culture. It should also do much more to encourage the teaching of Italian language, literature, and culture, from the grade school level to the university.

We are entering a new stage in the continuing evolution of an Italian American identity and an Italian American community. If I were to make a prediction, I think we are on the verge of an era of unity and creativity in which the Italian influence will permeate American society. The basis for this new age of Italian American emergence will be a cooperative relationship between the Italian American community and the Italian American artists and academics. This will be a fitting and long cherished memorial to those immigrant ancestors who laid the basis for these accomplishments through their sacrifices and sufferings. Then perhaps the ancient curse, "*Accidenti al'America e a quel Colombo che l'ha scoperta,*" will be laid to rest.

4

Carpatho-Ruthenian Resources and Assimilation, 1880-1924 : A Preliminary Survey*

RICHARD RENOFF

Even in this era of heightened ethnic awareness and pluralism most Americans are probably unaware of the existence of the tiny Carpatho-Ruthenian group which was part of the 1880-1924 "new immigration" to the new world.¹ The ancestors of these Slavic-Americans inhabited the southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains in pre-World War One Northern Hungary (present-day Eastern Czechoslovakia and Western Ukraine), where they had lived since the fourteenth century or earlier.² Although a thorough exposition of their distinguishing characteristics is beyond the scope of this paper, their unfamiliarity produces a necessity for more description than such highly familiar and larger groups of the "new immigration" such as Italians, Poles, and Russian Jews.

Major reasons for the unfamiliarity of these people are the absence of a distinct national consciousness among their European peasants and day-laborers and the varying identifications chosen by their intelligentsia in Europe and America. A peasant might only identify himself or herself as a resident of a local area such as a county, valley, or village and would be so provincial that he or she lacked a consciousness of the existence of culturally similar people living a short distance away. To this day, many descendants of these immigrants not infrequently identify their group as

*This paper is a greatly revised version of an address delivered at Mt. St Macrina, Uniontown, Pennsylvania, 11 August 1975.

nasi liudi (our people) and describe their spoken and written language as *po-nasemu* (according to our own way). These vague designations— yet precise in the minds of these people— add to the many already existing names the people call themselves or have been called by others.³

During the era of their mass immigration they were termed variously : Rusyns, Rusnaks, Ruthenians, Uhro-Rusyns (Hungarian-Ruthenians) and even Greek Catholics, the latter name being, for reasons we shall discuss below, a not completely surprising fusion of ethnic identity and religion. Especially since World War One substantial groups in the immigrant community— often for nationalistic, political, or religious reasons— have termed themselves Carpatho-Ruthenian, Carpatho-Russian, or Carpatho-Ukrainian and today some descendants of the immigrants even consider themselves Slovaks of the Byzantine (Greek) Rite.⁴ At the same time, members of the European intelligentsia frequently identified themselves as part of a larger group : the Hungarian, Russian, or to a lesser extent Ukrainian nationalities.⁵ The peasants, however, generally did not accept these broader identities.

An additional reason for their unfamiliarity is the fact that Americans typically use the nation-state from which one's ancestors migrated as an indicator of ethnicity.⁶ This is quite understandable for these nations may be found on maps and their representatives in the halls of the United Nations. There is, after all, a Germany (or Germanies), a Greece, an Italy, and a Poland, but no nation-states called Carpatho-Ruthenia, Frisia, or Macedonia. It is frequently very difficult for an American of English, French, Irish, or other Western European background to comprehend that while one's ancestors may have come from Czechoslovakia one is neither "Czechoslovak" nor Czech nor Slovak, but Carpatho-Ruthenian. It might also be noted in passing that the United States Census Bureau has followed this orientation throughout most of its history and has avoided such possible indices of ethnicity as self-identification and ancestry,⁷ a policy which poses problems for the demographic study of Carpatho-Ruthenians and other numerically small peoples.

Although the masses typically lacked a national consciousness amongst themselves, there were distinguishing cultural and social characteristics which set the Carpatho-Ruthenians apart

from the Slovak peasants, whose ethnic territory was to their west and south ; the Magyar peasants who inhabited the plain to their south ; and the Magyars and Jews who lived amongst them as bureaucrats, businessmen, and landlords. Carpatho-Ruthenian "habitation, dress, customs, folklore, occupations, and general life-style came to be hardly distinguishable from those of their immediate Slovak and Magyar neighbors,"⁸ but their language and above all their religion produced and perpetuated their distinctiveness.

Originally Eastern Orthodox, the Carpatho-Ruthenians united with Rome with the Union of Ungvar (Uzhhorod) in 1646.⁹ This agreement was merely legal, and the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, recited in Old Slavonic ; the married secular lower clergy ; the Julian calendar ; and the various folk religious customs and magical practices were retained. The Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church in large measure distinguished them from the Protestant and Roman Catholic Slovaks and Magyars, was very crucial for socializing the young, and facilitated the transmission of much of their culture. Membership in the Greek Catholic Church and the Carpatho-Ruthenian nationality became virtually synonymous ; in fact, at the end of World War One ninety-five per cent of the Carpatho-Ruthenians in Europe were Uniate.¹⁰

While their language, basically Ukrainian, came to be influenced by the Hungarian, Great Russian, Old Slavonic, Polish, Slovak, and even German languages¹¹ and was intelligible to the Eastern Slovaks,¹² it did differentiate them from the non-Slavic Magyars and Germans, and the Western Slavic speaking Slovaks. Still, religion was probably more crucial than language for maintaining their distinct identity because even those persons of Carpatho-Ruthenian descent who had assimilated into the Magyar culture¹³ usually retained their Greek Catholic faith.

To understand the European background and the American experience of Carpatho-Ruthenians something should be said about the social and economic character of the region from which they migrated. A perusal of the places of birth listed in the death notices which have appeared in the *Amerikansky russky viestnik* (now called *Greek Catholic Union Messenger*) reveals that most migrants came from what is today northeastern Czechoslovakia, the former Hungarian counties of Szepes (Slovak : Spis),

Saros (Saris), and Zemplen (Zemplin).¹⁴ A sizeable portion also migrated from Ung (Uz) County which is the westernmost section of what is today the Transcarpathian Oblast' of Soviet Ukraine, but the migration from the more easterly counties of Maramaros (Maramaros), Ugocsa (Ugoca), and Bereg was less substantial.¹⁵

In 1910, Emily Greene Balch in her pioneer work, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, commented on the spread of the migration from this region :

The movement seems to have begun in the northeastern part of the Slovak district in Zemplen, Saros, Szepes ... and Ung. This district is racially very mixed, containing large numbers of Jews, Germans and Ruthenians, besides Slovaks.

From the counties where emigration first began the movement has spread, affecting both the Ruthenians of Hungary in the counties to the east of the Slovaks, and the Slovak counties to the west of the first emigration district, and quite recently those to the southwest also.¹⁶

Why did these people come? Why did they leave the intimacy of village life for the loneliness, perils, and uncertainties of the crossing? In general, the major causes of this emigration were demographic and economic. Following the abolition of serfdom in Hungary in 1848, the people began to subdivide the land among their children.¹⁷ This land was unable to support the growing population and many farmers were reduced to being propertyless day-laborers. Many became foresters and others worked as seasonal migrant laborers in the Hungarian Plain to the south. Eventually, they learned of the wealth and wages of the new world and the distance of their migrations increased. Other factors "pushing" and "pulling" the migrants were: attempts to avoid army conscription, the influence of steamship agents, and the letters from relatives and the friends who had already journeyed across the ocean.¹⁸

Eastern Slovakia and Ruthenia were economically underdeveloped. There was virtually no industry and agricultural techniques were primitive. The timber industry was probably the most prosperous sector of the economy as about one-half of Ruthenia was covered by forest and there was relatively little arable land.¹⁹

Of all the nationalities of pre-War Hungary the Ruthenes ...

were perhaps the poorest and most neglected. The prosperity which they are said to have enjoyed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had given place to a long decadence. The outer world hardly knew them, save when they descended in their droves at harvest-time and stood about the market place of Debreczen or Nyiregyhaza for hiring ... the Ruthenes were not thought fit for any better employment than lumbering, acting as ghillies on the huge deer forests which covered most of the country, or scratching a miserable livelihood out of the tiny plots left to them under the shadow of the trees.²⁰

The United States Immigration Commission reported that the mean daily wage when food was provided for farm laborers in Slovakia in 1905 was 23 cents for men, 13 cents for women, and 9 cents for children ; without food, the corresponding figures were 32 cents, 20 cents, and 14 cents.²¹ Most likely the wages in Eastern Slovakia and Ruthenia were slightly lower. Thus, the wages of \$1·92 for Ruthenian men²² and \$1·36 for women²³ paid in American factories and mines were considered attractive and pulled the Carpatho-Ruthenians from their homeland to industrial states like Connecticut, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

During an analysis of the concept of social power Robert Bierstedt cited resources as a source of power and argued that if two groups are about equal in numbers and similar in social organization access to greater resources would give a group superior power.

Resources may be of many kinds— money, property, prestige, knowledge, competence, deceit, fraud, secrecy, and, of course, all of the things usually included under the term "natural resources". There are also supernatural resources in the case of religious associations, which as agencies of a celestial government, apply supernatural sanctions as instruments of control.²⁴

Some years later, Hubert M. Blalock used the same term to denote "the actual sources of power, or those properties of the individual or group that provide the power potential or the ability to exercise power."²⁵

In this paper the concept of resources is utilized with a some-

what different purpose from Bierstedt's and Blalock's. While the indicators are similar to those of these writers, those resources of the Carpatho-Ruthenians are examined which potentially promoted or retarded their assimilation to American culture rather than enhanced their power. We shall explore some resources which Carpatho-Ruthenians brought from the old country and the adaptability of these resources to the structural and cultural conditions encountered in the host society.

More precisely, our notion of resources includes some demographic and socio-economic variables stated or implied by Bierstedt and Blalock under the term "natural resources" and some institutional characteristics some of which were especially peculiar to Carpatho-Ruthenians. The demographic characteristics to be examined are: return migration, sex ratio, and age distribution; the socio-economic are: literacy, and occupations. The institutional characteristics of these people which will also be discussed: mutual aid, societies, boarding houses, the ethnic press, and the Church; both helped and hampered their assimilation and shall be examined following the discussion of demographic and economic factors.

Assimilation will be used in the sense of cultural assimilation, defined by Milton M. Gordon as a "change of cultural patterns to those of the host society."²⁶ Such structural components of assimilation as entrance into primary group relationships with majority group members and intermarriage are not the main focus of this paper although the implications for these issues will be occasionally discussed. It might be noted that cultural assimilation also facilitates or is a concomitant of socio-economic mobility. While not wishing to confound these concepts, some of the data, (e.g., literacy, occupations) have implications for the potential socio-economic mobility of these people.

Although much of the early literature on immigration emphasized the desirability of the disappearance of the cultures of Eastern and Southern European immigrants,²⁷ we wish to avoid considering the Americanization of immigrants as a positive goal either for the host society or the immigrant community. In fact, Carpatho-Ruthenian institutions, most notably the church, have been crucial in promoting cultural pluralism. In the third century of our country's existence, there seems no longer a question of

whether we shall have cultural pluralism; we do and apparently will.

The method employed was a perusal of the sparse literature dealing with Carpatho-Ruthenian immigration, much of it contemporary to their mass migration. Published American and Hungarian statistical data were also examined in an attempt to roughly gauge the demographic and socio-economic nature of the immigration and its relevancy for resources and assimilation. The preliminary nature of this survey should be stressed; indeed, relatively little data are available on these people which are not presented combined with data and discussion of other groups.

THE RETURN MIGRATION

Many Carpatho-Ruthenians evidently did not initially intend to stay in the new world. For these early migrants America was often just another place to engage in migratory labor.²⁸ Although more stayed and continued to arrive then subsequently returned, the repatriation of Carpatho-Ruthenians was extensive enough to warrant an examination of Hungarian and American statistics in order to gain an approximation of its scope. Although the data of the two countries are somewhat inconsistent and the Carpatho-Ruthenians were statistically confused with other ethnic groups (e.g., Slovaks and Ukrainians), a rough guess is that possibly as many as one-third of the migrants returned to the old country at least once.

An examination of Table I which is adapted from Hungarian emigration statistics reveals that between 1899 and 1913 there were about thirty return migrants to the Hungarian counties of Szepes, Saros, and Zemplen (present-day Eastern Slovakia) for every hundred departing. These statistics, while they are for the counties whence most Carpatho-Ruthenians migrated during the peak migration years, include not merely Carpatho-Ruthenians, but also Slovaks, Hungarians, and others. Since according to Hungarian statistics only 6 per cent of the emigrating population of Szepes, 9 per cent of Zemplen, and 14 per cent of Saros was Ruthenian; we must not commit the fallacy of assuming that the total return migration rates for these counties are exactly characteristic of the Carpatho-Ruthenians. Nevertheless, an interesting association obtains between the percentage of Carpatho-Ruthenians

in a county and the number of in-migrants relative to out-migrants for the three counties listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1
EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION— HUNGARIAN
COUNTIES (PRESENT EASTERN SLOVAKIA), 1899-1913

County	Emigrants	Percentage of Ruthenians among emigrants	Immigrants	Number arriving per 100 departing
Szepes	46,007	6%	10,884	24
Zemplen	82,584	9%	26,763	31
Saros	50,390	14%	18,472	36

Source : "Kivandorlása és visszavandorlása a Magyar szent Korona országainak, 1899-1913" ("Emigration and Return of Emigres of the Nations of the Hungarian Holy Crown from 1899 to 1913"), *Magyar statisztikai kozlemenyek*, vol. LXVII, new series (Budapest : Anonymous Publishing Society of Pest, 1918), 2-5, 21-23.

In contrast, Hungarian statistics indicate relatively little return migration to the counties of Ung, Ugocsa, Bereg, and Maramaros, which had higher proportions of Carpatho-Ruthenians in their population than Szepes, Saros, and Zemplen. Table 2 shows data on emigration and immigration for the four more eastern counties which later became part of the autonomous Czechoslovak province of Sub-Carpathian-Ruthenia and are now part of the Trans-Carpathian Oblast' of Soviet Ukraine.

TABLE 2
EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION— HUNGARIAN
COUNTIES (PRESENT WESTERN SOVIET UKRAINE) 1899-1913

County	Emigrants	Percentage of Ruthenians among emigrants	Immigrants	Number arriving per 100 departing
Ung	82,584	27%	26,763	32
Ugocsa	11,916	33%	1,503	13
Bereg	22,868	49%	4,094	18
Maramaros	11,980	62%	2,424	20

Source : "Kivandorlása és visszavandorlása a Magyar szent Korona országainak, 1899-1913" ("Emigration and Return of Emigres of the Nations of the Hungarian Holy Crown from 1899 to 1913") *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, vol. LXVII, new series (Budapest : Anonymous Publishing Society of Pest, 1918), 2-5, 21-23.

A possible explanation for the relatively small reverse migration to the more homogeneously Carpatho-Ruthenian counties of the East is the fact that the emigration from the eastern counties commenced later than in the West, the return flow having not yet begun. Also, a slightly higher degree of economic development in the West (present day Eastern Slovakia) might have stimulated more people to return there than to the more impoverished East. Further analysis of the Hungarian statistics on a year-to-year basis would be warranted.²⁹

The United States Immigration Commission only began compiling statistics on repatriation for the various "races and peoples" in 1908. Immigration statistics for the fiscal years 1908, 1909 and 1910 show that only twelve (12) Ruthenians departed for every one hundred admitted during those years. This figure is substantially below both our own guess and the Hungarian data for the years 1899-1913 presented in Tables 1 and 2.

The American statistic places the Ruthenian well below such Slavic groups as "Croatian and Slovenian"— fifty-six (56) and "Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin"— twenty-eight (28). In fact, of the twenty-nine European and Middle Eastern nationalities listed, the Ruthenian ranked only twenty-first. Of significance for future research is the fact that the statistic reported for the Magyars is sixty-four (64) and for the Slovaks fifty-nine (59).³¹ Many Carpatho-Ruthenians were probably classified as Slovaks since they migrated from the predominantly Slovak counties of Szepes, Saros, and Zemplen. This suggests the possibility of more actual repatriation than was reported for Ruthenians. Furthermore, the American authorities combined Ruthenians from south of the Carpathians with migrants from Galicia which was north of the mountains in the Austrian part of the Dual Monarchy. Due to this confusion concerning ethnic identity, the American statistics on Ruthenian repatriation are probably even

less reliable than the also inadequate Hungarian data for attempting to assess the magnitude of Carpatho-Ruthenian repatriation.

A variety of personal, familial, social, and economic factors stimulated the return to the homeland. Personal and familial factors include the death of a relative and the desire among the males, who found a scarcity of women from their own group, to find a wife. As H. J. Habakkuk has argued, economic development and migration patterns are affected by family structure; among the Slovaks and Ruthenians the absence of a single-heir system produced a temporary rather than permanent migration.³²

Downtrends in the American economy appear to be an extremely significant factor accounting for repatriation. For example, during 1908 more persons entered Hungary than departed from Szepes, Saros, and Zemplen, the predominantly Slovak counties which also contained substantial Carpatho-Ruthenian minorities. An economic panic occurred in America during 1907 which evidently also stimulated more Italians to leave America than were admitted in 1908.³³ Not only was the Carpatho-Ruthenian immigration pushed by economic conditions in the homeland, the stimulus for the reverse migration may also have been economic in large measure.

Much has been written about the effects of repatriates upon their native land,³⁴ but far less on the functions and dysfunctions of reverse migration for the immigrant community. Although reverse migration promoted the retention of old world cultural traits and slowed down assimilation, it also strengthened group cohesion. Language and ties to the Greek Catholic Church would be retained longer and both were crucial in promoting cohesion and identity among Carpatho-Ruthenians. More so than for most other groups, the Church, as we have seen, was the symbol of their identity, distinguishing them from others and promoting social solidarity. This special character of the Church, retained a little longer due to reverse migration, became an additional resource easing their anomie and alienation in the new world.

Carpatho-Ruthenian repatriation was probably not substantially greater than that of the typical "new immigration" group. What may well be unique about the Carpatho-Ruthenians was the temporary residence of many of their early clerical leaders

who (until 1907) were subject to their old world bishops rather than to their own or Roman rite bishops in America. Furthermore, the presence of Greek Catholic emigre priests did not please American Catholic church officials.³⁵ Thus, the Carpatho-Ruthenian intellectual elite was not always disposed to encourage the Americanization of the immigrants because it contemplated a return to Europe. Whatever its causes, the Carpatho-Ruthenian repatriation probably temporarily slowed the short-term assimilation of this community to American culture, but at the same time promoted its long term cultural assimilation, adjustment, and social cohesion.³⁶

THE SEX RATIO

In his classic, *The Italian Emigration of Our Times*, Robert F. Foerster described a "law" of emigration, which epitomizes the trends among Carpatho-Ruthenians :

The first immigrants are nearly all men ; after a while the women and children follow ; emigration ceases—the cycle is complete.³⁷

Concerning the question whether Carpatho-Ruthenians differed appreciably from other immigrant groups in their sex ratio, American and Hungarian statistics are somewhat more congruent than the repatriation statistics. Based on these data, a guess of two male migrants for every female migrant prior to World War One is possibly a conservative figure.

Although no sub-division according to mother-tongue was presented, there are Hungarian statistics on the sex of emigres from the seven counties with substantial Carpatho-Ruthenian populations ; again we must avoid the fallacy of assuming these statistics as representative of Carpatho-Ruthenians *per se*.

The data in Table 3 show that the percentage of males among the emigrants is generally highest in those counties—Bereg, Maramaros, and Ugocsa—that are farthest east. (A significant exception is Ung County which has a lower percentage of men than Saros and Zemplen.) This geographic distribution probably reflects the fact that the migration from the eastern counties did not reach substantial numbers until the migration from the western counties was well underway.

TABLE 3
SEX OF EMIGRES FROM HUNGARIAN COUNTIES WITH SUBSTANTIAL
CARPATHO-RUTHENIAN POPULATIONS, 1899-1913

<i>Western Counties</i> (present Eastern Slovakia)	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Per cent Male</i>
Szepes	26,867	19,140	46,007	58%
Saros	31,078	19,315	50,393	68%
Zemplen	51,578	31,006	82,584	66%
	<hr/> 109,523	<hr/> 69,461	<hr/> 178,984	<hr/> 61%

<i>Eastern Counties</i> (present Soviet Ukraine)	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Per cent Male</i>
Ung	28,354	17,303	45,657	62%
Bereg	15,972	6,896	22,868	70%
Ugocsa	8,715	3,201	11,916	73%
Maramaros	9,530	2,450	11,980	80%
	<hr/> 62,571	<hr/> 29,850	<hr/> 92,421	<hr/> 68%

Source: "Kivandorlása és visszavandorlása a Magyar szent Korona országainak, 1899-1910" ("Emigration and Return of Emigres of the Nations of the Hungarian Holy Crown from 1899 to 1913"), *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, vol. LXVII, new series (Budapest: Anonymous Publishing Society of Pest, 1918), 10-13.

American data are substantially consistent with the Hungarian. The Immigration Commission published the sex ratios of immigrants for the years 1899-1910 inclusive. Of the twenty-nine European and Middle Eastern "races or peoples" reported, the Ruthenians ranked twelfth highest in percentage of males among the total number of immigrants. With a range of 47·9 per cent males for the Irish to 96·3 per cent for the Turks, the Ruthenian figures of 74·4³⁸ indicate that these people were not radically different from most Slavic and non-Slavic groups for those years.

An excess of males would conceivably lead to exogamy and promote the structural assimilation of some individuals and stimulate the formation of boarding house communities and delay the development of stable family and community life among others.

The extent to which this factor actually did affect community life and adjustment is difficult to assess with accuracy, but Carpatho-Ruthenians probably experienced no greater barriers against cultural assimilation because of it than the typical Southern and Eastern European groups.

Carpatho-Ruthenians do seem to fit the "law" of early male arrival followed by women and children. Hungarian statistics on the sex of emigrants from the seven counties where most Carpatho-Ruthenians resided were divided according to the years: 1899-1904, 1905-1907, and 1908-1913. These data, showing number of women per 100 males, are summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 4

WOMEN PER HUNDRED MALES EMIGRATING FROM HUNGARIAN COUNTIES WITH SUBSTANTIAL RUTHENIAN POPULATIONS FOR SELECTED YEARS

County	1899-1904	1905-1907	1908-1913
Szepes	56	74	99
Saros	54	63	79
Zemplen	44	60	84
Ung	42	54	94
Bereg	21	36	73
Ugocsa	24	25	50
Maramaros	22	20	33

Source: "Kivandorlása és visszavandorlása a Magyar szent Korona országainak, 1899-1913" ("Emigration and Return of Emigres of the Nations of the Hungarian Holy Crown from 1899 to 1913"), *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, vol. LXVII, new series (Budapest: Anonymous Publishing Society of Pest, 1918), 11-13.

In general, these statistics show a steady increase in the proportion of women among the migrants during these years, the only exception being slight drop in Maramaros for 1905-1907 relative to 1899-1904. These data also indicate that the eastern counties (Bereg, Ugocsa and Maramaros), which are also those with the highest proportion of Carpatho-Ruthenians, were lagging behind the western counties in developing a balanced sex ratio among the emigres. This could reflect a peculiar characteristic of Carpatho-Ruthenians, but more likely is due to the relative recency

of mass migration from the East. Unfortunately, the lack of data on Carpatho-Ruthenians *per se* is a serious limitation of these statistics.

THE AGE DISTRIBUTION

While the disproportion of men among the immigrants produced dysfunctions for family life, their youth and strength enabled them to initially take unskilled jobs which the English-speaking groups such as the English and Irish were beginning to reject.

The Slavs have brawn for sale. Herein, at bottom is the drawing force which accounts for such a moving in of peoples with the readiness with which they find their places in the specialized industries of the district. Pittsburgh has clamorous need for these men. Take the average Lithuanian, Croatian, Ruthenian, or Slovak, and his physique would compare favorably with that of any people These men come to be 'the hewers of wood and the carriers of water'.³⁹

Hungarian data for the years 1905-1907 and 1911-1913 reveal (see Table 5) that about sixty-five per cent of the migrant (family heads and isolates) were under thirty years of age and approximately eighty-five per cent were under forty. This finding is not surprising; the age distribution of Carpatho-Ruthenians is typical of other international migrants. The youthfulness of immigrants eased their adjustment to the host society and enabled them to take advantage of the economic opportunities in the industrial Northeast.

TABLE 5

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RUTHENIAN EMIGRANTS FROM
HUNGARY FOR SELECTED YEARS (HEADS OF
FAMILIES AND ISOLATES)

<i>Age</i>	<i>1905-1907</i>	<i>1911-1913</i>
Under 20	30%	26%
20-29	35%	39%
30-39	25%	19%
40-49	10%	14%
Over 50	1%	2%
	<hr/> <i>101%*</i>	<hr/> <i>100%</i>

* Rounding Error

Source: "Kivandorlása és visszavandorlása a Magyar szent Korona országainak, 1899-1913," ("Emigration and the Return of Emigres of the Nations of the Hungarian Holy Crown from 1899-1913"), *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, vol. XLVII, new series (Budapest: Anonymous Publishing Society of Pest, 1918), 34.

LITERACY AND OCCUPATIONS

If a sophisticated attempt were made to determine *the* most culturally, socially, and economically deprived immigrant group, the Carpatho-Ruthenian would be among the contenders for this distinction. Their cultural and material deprivation seems to have rivaled or surpassed that of other non-Magyar minority nationalities of Hungary such as the Croats, Rumanians, and Slovaks⁴⁰ and their financial straits may even have been more desperate than the Sicilians and Southern Italians.

An assumption is usually made that groups with high literacy rates such as the Czechs, Germans, and Scandanavians—albeit in their native tongue—had a head-start toward cultural assimilation, educational attainment, and economic mobility in American society. If this assumption is valid, the Carpatho-Ruthenians arrived in America with a distinct disadvantage. United States immigration statistics for 1899 to 1910 show that fifty-three (53) per cent of the Ruthenian (both Galician and Sub-Carpathian) migrants over fourteen years of age could neither read nor write; this percentage was exceeded only by the Portuguese, Southern Italians, and Turks among the twenty-nine European and Middle Eastern groups on which statistics were compiled.⁴¹ Although the study of Carpatho-Ruthenian inter-generational and intra-generational mobility is beyond the scope of this paper, we should note that this handicap surely contributed to the relegation of these people to the most strenuous and unsafe unskilled occupations in the mills and mines immediately following their arrival.

Hungarian emigration statistics on the occupations of migrants most of whom went to America, reveal that twenty-two (22) per cent of the Ruthenian emigres were "independent" farmers, fifty (50) per cent were domestic or agricultural workers, and seventeen (17) per cent were day laborers. For the years 1911-1913, the corresponding figures were: twenty-six (26) per cent, fifty-six (56) per cent, and thirteen (13) per cent. Data for other

Hungarian nationalities show that their situation was roughly comparable to that of the Slovaks and that they had a significantly greater proportion of independent farmers but fewer domestic and agricultural workers than the Rumanians.⁴²

American data are not directly comparable to the Hungarian because the occupational categories differ, but the general tendency is similar. Table 6 which we have adapted from immigration statistics, shows the occupational distribution for selected European and Middle Eastern "races or people" for the years 1899-1909. It reveals that Ruthenians were lowest of all groups in the proportion of immigrants having what we have termed "middle class occupations" (professionals, skilled workers, and farmers), and third highest in the proportion of "working class occupations" (farm laborers, common laborers, and servants).

TABLE 6
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF EUROPEAN
IMMIGRANT GROUPS, 1899-1909.

(A partial display of 29 groups, ranked by the percentage of the group classified as "working class".)

<i>Group</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Working Class</i>	<i>Middle Class</i>	<i>Miscellaneous and no occupation</i>
Rumanian	1	88·1%	3·2%	8·8%
Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin	2	87·7%	6·7%	5·6%
Ruthenian	3	84·5%	2·2%	13·4%
Croatian, and Slovenian	4	82·4%	6·2%	11·3%
Greek	5	75·6%	9·2%	11·2%
..... 19 groups not shown				
Spanish	25	24·3%	38·4%	37·3%
Welsh	26	17·0%	40·2%	42·8%
English	27	16·2%	36·8%	47·0%
Scotch	28	15·8%	43·0%	41·2%
Hebrew	29	13·9%	37·5%	48·7%

Source : United States Immigration Commission, *Abstract of Reports of the Immigration Commission*, vol. I (Washington : Govt. Printing Office, 1911), p. 173.

CARPATHO-RUTHENIAN INSTITUTIONS

The preceding discussion of Carpatho-Ruthenian demographic and economic characteristics would suggest that in several respects Carpatho-Ruthenian immigrants did not possess a background which facilitated assimilation into urban, industrial America. They were semi-literate where literacy was needed to fully function ; they were farmers entering an industrial society ; and they were poor in a society that valued riches. Yet other cultural and social characteristics, less amenable to numerical tabulation, functioned to reinforce the cohesion and organization of their community and helped conserve many aspects of their culture, at the same time facilitating their assimilation and adjustment to American society.

In the paragraphs below we shall discuss four Carpatho-Ruthenian institutions: the mutual aid society, the press, the boarding house, and the Greek Catholic Church. None of these, of course, was unusual or peculiar to Carpatho-Ruthenians ; indeed, some other small groups (e. g., Lebanese, Rumanians, and Ukrainians) were partly comprised of Greek Catholic Uniates. Still, their religious institution, being a national church, was distinctive enough from the larger Roman Catholic Church to prevent the complete absorption of the Carpatho-Ruthenians into American Catholicism. Along with the lodges and newspapers (which were quasi-religious), the Carpatho-Ruthenian Church became a prime buttress of Carpatho-Ruthenian pluralism.

The first and major Carpatho-Ruthenian mutual-aid society is the Greek Catholic Union founded in 1892. Some years later the United Societies and the Carpatho-Russian Benevolent Association-Liberty were founded.⁴⁴ These organizations functioned to unite the people in the presence of hardship and the hostility of their neighbors who did not understand their customs, to ease the financial hardships resulting from industrial accidents and death, to provide contacts for newcomers to the parish and town, and they also had recreational functions. These societies were criticized by some observers, however, on the grounds that they tended to slow down the Americanization of the immigrants.⁴⁵

Margaret F. Byington in her volume prepared for "The Pittsburgh Survey", *Homestead: The Households of a Mill Town*, noted the importance of these societies in the social life of

immigrants.⁴⁶ Interestingly, a statistical table in this volume indicates that the death and disability benefits paid by the Greek Catholic Union were about as high as those of any of the nine Hungarian and Slavic societies she studied.⁴⁷

Byington summarized the contributions made by these societies to communal life and to the individual :

These lodges play an important part in social life. They offer some amusement in a community where there is little else available for the Slavs. The meetings themselves, while nominally for business, afford a chance for coming together, while dances and other festivities are held at intervals. Through them the stranger comes quickly into touch with his own people. Especially is this true of men who move from one part of the country to another in search of work. Traveling cards issued by the home lodge of a society, and recognized by members of the local lodge in any community, assure a man welcome and assistance wherever he goes. This service, a strong feature with any fraternal order, is particularly valuable to the Slav, with his ignorance of the ways of the new county and even of its language. The fellow members of a lodge become nurses who care for the sick or injured during nights of suffering, and friends who give comfort in times of bereavement.⁴⁸

A second institution that reinforced communal life and facilitated both assimilation and pluralism was the immigrant press. By reading the *Amerikansky russky viestnik*, *Prosvita*, *Rusin*, *Vostok* or other papers,⁴⁹ the immigrant became conscious that he (or she) was part of a wider world than his (or her) native village, boarding house, neighborhood, or work place. The newcomer became not just a person from Saros or Zemplen but a "Carpatho-Russian" or Carpatho-Ruthenian. Thus, the press, notably the *Amerikansky russky viestnik*, was crucial in broadening Carpatho-Ruthenian national consciousness.⁵⁰ The Carpatho-Ruthenian language, the use of which was eroding in Europe, was perpetuated by the immigrant press and the people came to perceive themselves as belonging to a special group.⁵¹

These publications also contained secular and spiritual advice which helped ease alienation and loneliness in the new land. In a word, by reading an ethnic newspaper the immigrants learned

that they were not alone and that others shared their plight.

A third institution was the boarding house. A prime reason for its existence was the imbalance in the sex ratio—the excess of men. The boarding house, of course, was neither unique to nor the exclusive property of the Carpatho-Ruthenians. Croatians, Lithuanians, Magyars, Poles, Russians, Slovaks, and Southern Italians all had them. However, the Immigration Commission reported that, among some samples of families it studied, the Ruthenians (both Galician and Sub-Carpathian) had the fifth highest percentage of families that took in boarders (57 per cent) among thirty-nine foreign-born groups.⁵²

What was life like in a boarding house? Single men would move into a house supervised by a boarding boss and his wife; the Carpatho-Ruthenian women did not typically work outside the home, but they were very likely to take in boarders. Each man would pay about three or four dollars a month for a place to sleep, for having his clothes washed, and his food cooked. Also, an account was kept of the food purchased and divided *pro rata* among the men on pay day. For special orders such as veal or fruit, the men were charged individually. Sometimes the boarding boss and his wife and children slept in the same room as the men; even the cooking might be done in that room. There is a photograph in the 1909 volume of the journal, *Charities and the Commons*, entitled, "Night Scene in a Slavic Lodging House". It shows twelve men in a room, hats and coats hung on hooks or nails, and what appears to be empty beer bottles. The sub-caption states that in many of these boarding houses the men slept in shifts, day workers sleeping at night and night workers sleeping by day.⁵³

The immigrant boarding house is an institution that has been neglected by sociologists of the family and sociologists of community. Among its functions was to provide a quasi-family setting for lonely men who were either single or whose wives and children were in Europe. It also gave the immigrant an opportunity to experience the comfort of being with people of his own ethnic group after experiencing draining, exhausting, and dehumanizing work in the foundries, factories, and mines. Very important was the cheapness of living in this setting; social workers were amazed at how cheaply Slavic boarders could live. Due to their low

expenses the men were able to eventually send for their families or perhaps go back to Saros, Szepes, Zemplen, or farther east and return with a wife. Thus, families, houses, churches, and communities were built on the labor and savings of these boarders.

Another institution that strengthened pluralism and social cohesion was the Greek Catholic Church.⁵¹ The religious customs of the Carpatho-Ruthenians were not only indicative of their communal ties but also reinforced them.

First, the liturgy was sung by both priest and people. Most of the Carpatho-Ruthenian lay people were very familiar with the religious rituals since they participated in singing the liturgy in the Old Slavonic tongue; which, although not a living language, was much more intelligible to them than the Latin language was to the laity of the Western Church. In contrast, prior to the Second Vatican Council, the priests of the Western Church celebrated Mass with their backs to the congregation and there was much less interaction between priest and people and virtually none among the faithful themselves.

Furthermore, the aloofness expected of the clergymen of the Western Church was spurned by most married priests of the East. A survey of Eastern Christian clergymen produced findings which support the contention that married priests are close to their fold. After conducting a poll of ninety-seven married Orthodox and Uniate priests, Father Robert Clement, writing in *Eastern Churches Review*, concluded that the "married priest seems by his very nature better adapted to be head of a parish on a down to earth level ..." ⁵² The Carpatho-Ruthenians themselves defined their married priests as an essential mark of their Eastern rites and feared that the introduction of celibacy would separate the clergy from the people. Hence, the presence of the wife and children of a married priest made him both a spiritual and earthly father and made him a more integral part of the community.

In addition to the promotion of social cohesion by the liturgy, the fact that a very high percentage of Carpatho-Ruthenians always attended services further strengthened this closeness. Professor Andrew Perejda summarized this very well when he stated, "... in the life of the Rusyn the church was a unifying factor. The people live around the church. Very few, if any, did not go..." ⁵³

Besides the institutions we have discussed— mutual aid societies, the press, boarding houses, and the Church— future studies of community among the Carpatho-Ruthenians might focus upon such topics as family and kinship,⁵⁷ trade unions,⁵⁸ athletic organizations such as the *sokols*, neighborhoods, schools, and even saloons. Their functions and dysfunctions and the conflict and consensus they generated could be examined by sociologists of various theoretical and empirical orientations.

CONCLUSION

Our preliminary survey of Carpatho-Ruthenian resources indicates that Carpatho-Ruthenians did not differ appreciably in their demographic characteristics (repatriation, sex ratio, age) from other "new immigration" groups, but ranked near the bottom among these groups in literacy rates and occupational distribution. To compare the Carpatho-Ruthenian group with "old immigration" would be very problematic and unfair; in fact, Oscar Handlin has carefully noted the biases against "new immigrants" inherent in the reports of the Dillingham Commission.⁵⁹ Although their educational and occupational mobility was probably slowed due to these handicaps, their communal and institutional resources produced a pluralistic response and hastened their adjustment and their partial cultural assimilation. This pluralism is still evident; Carpatho-Ruthenian communications, fraternal, and religious institutions are very viable despite the attempts of religious and secular authorities to "Americanize" these people.

Future research should focus on local communities using such sources as parish records of the Orthodox and Greek Catholic (Uniate) Churches, city directories, and the now publicly available United States Census Schedules for 1900. Unexplored areas besides the ones we have surveyed include: ethnic and religious inter-marriage rates, family-size, housing characteristics, intra-generational and inter-generational socio-economic mobility, and internal migration patterns.

FOOTNOTES

1. A rough guess as to the present number of Carpatho-Ruthenian Americans with at least one Carpatho-Ruthenian ancestor is 750,000.

Membership in the two ethnic Churches, the three Ruthenian Byzantine (Greek Catholic) dioceses (278,766) and the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church (about 100,000), totalled 378,766 in 1975. This figure, of course, does not take into account those persons who have joined the Roman Catholic Latin-Rite, the Russian Orthodox Church, the religiously unaffiliated and the handful who have joined Protestant bodies. For the statistics see, *The Official Catholic Directory* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1976) p. 530; p. 628; p. 631; *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches*, ed. Constant H. Jacquet (Nashville; Abingdon, 1976), p. 28.

2. C. A. Macartney, *Hungary and her Successors : The Treaty of Trianon and its Consequences, 1919-1937* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 206; an excellent review of the research on the date the early Carpatho-Ruthenian settlement of this region is, Paul R. Magocsi, "An Historio-graphical Guide to Subcarpathian Rus"; *Austrian History Yearbook*, IX-X (1973-1974), 214-218.
3. Rev. John Slivka has enumerated seventeen national or religious names used for this group; cf. John Slivka, *Correct Nomenclature : Greek Rite or Byzantine Rite, Rusin or Ruthenian, Rusin or Slovak* (Brooklyn, N. Y.: privately printed, 1973), pp. 2-3.
4. Cf. Michael Lacko, "A Brief Survey of the History of the Slovak Catholics of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite," *Slovak Studies III, Cyrillo-Methodiana* (1963), 199-224. Lacko argues that most Greek Catholic inhabitants of Eastern Slovakia are, in fact, Slovaks who during the early period of immigration could not understand the preaching of priests from Ruthenia.
5. The emigre intellectuals most of whom were priests, were also usually either Magyarone or Russopoile prior to World War One; Stephen C. Gulovich, "The Rusin Exarchate in the United States." *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, VI, no. 8, (October-December, 1946), 463.
6. Florian Znaniecki, *Modern Nationalities : A Sociological Study* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), pp. xiii-xiv; William Petersen, "On the Subnations of Western Europe" in *Ethnicity : Theory and Experience*, ed. Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975) pp. 177-182.
7. The United States Census Bureau has for the most part recorded country of origin and to a lesser extent mother-tongue for the foreign-born and the first-generation. An early statement on the problems in determining the ethnic background of American immigrants is, Richard Boechk, "The Determination of Racial Stock among American Immigrants," *American Statistical Association Journal*, n-s, X (December, 1906), 199-221.
For proposals to modify these shortcoming see Michael Novak, "The Census of 1980," *Empac*, no. 10 (October, 1976), pp. 3-5.
8. Pavel Macu, "National Assimilation : The Case of the Rusyn-Ukrainians of Czechoslovakia," *East Central Europe*, II, no. 2 (1975), 103.

9. Michael Lacko, "The Union of Uzhhorod", *Slovak Studies*, VI (1966), 7-190; Basil Boysak, *The Fate of the Holy Union in Carpatho-Ukraine*. (Toronto: privately published, 1963) pp. 17-86.
10. Aldo Dami, *La Ruthenie Subcarpathique*, (Geneva: Les Editions du Mont-Blanc, 1944), p. 104.
 In America a substantial minority converted to Russian Orthodoxy. Consult, for example, Keith S. Russin, "Father Alexis G. Toth and the Wilkes-Barre Litigations," *St. Vladimirs Theological Quarterly*, XVI, no. 3, (1972), 128-149.
11. On the various linguistic influences see, Michail Lesiow, "The Language of Carpatho-Ruthenian Publications" in *Proceedings of the Conference on Carpatho-Ruthenian Immigration—8 June, 1974*, ed. Richard Renoff and Stephen Reynolds (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1975), pp. 32-42.
12. Paul R. Magocsi, "Carpatho-Ruthenian Language and Literature". Address delivered at Mt. St. Macrina, Uniontown, Pa., 12 August, 1975.
13. On the magyarization of the Carpatho-Ruthenian intelligentsia see Macartney, *Hungary and her Successors*, p. 210 *et passim*.
14. Place-names are given in Hungarian with Slovak or Carpatho-Ruthenian names in parentheses.
15. Cf. Nicholas Dorko, "The Geographical Background of the Faithful of the Apostolic Exarchate of Pittsburgh", *Slovak Studies*, IV. Historica 2 (1964), 217-221. Dorko, who considers most of these people "Slovak", surveyed the death notices and found that over one-third came from Zemplen (Zemplin) and the vast majority of the remainder from the other three western counties,
16. Emily Greene Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* (New York: Charities Publications Committee, 1910) pp. 99-101.
17. Ruthenia and Slovakia did not have single-heir inheritance; H. J. Habakkuk, "Family Structure and Economic Change in Nineteenth Century Europe," *Journal of Economic History*, XV, no. 1 (1955), 9.
18. Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, pp. 47-53.
19. Dami, *La Ruthenie Subcarpathique*, p. 60; Macartney, *Hungary and her Successors*, p. 235.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 204-205.
21. U. S. Immigration Commission, *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, vol. IV, *Emigration Conditions in Europe* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1911), p. 365.
22. U. S. Immigration Commission, *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, *Immigrants in Industries*, part 23, *Summary Report on Immigrants in Manufacturing and Mining*. vol. I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1911), p. 104.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 106.

76 CARPATHO-RUTHENIAN RESOURCES & ASSIMILATION, 1880-1924

24. Robert Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power", *American Sociological Review*, XV, no. 6 (December, 1950), 737.
25. Hubert M. Blalock, *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations* (New York : Wiley, 1967), p. 113. Cf. also, R. A. Schermerhorn, "Toward a General Theory of Minority Groups," *Phylon*, XXV, no. 3 (Fall, 1964), 244 for a similar point on power.
26. Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origin* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 71.
27. Cf., Jerome Davis, *The Russians and Ruthenians in America: Bolsheviks or Brothers* (New York : George H. Doran, 1922), xiv and 155 pp. Also, Kenneth D. Miller, *Peasant Pioneers: An Interpretation of the Slavic Peoples in the United States* (New York : Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, 1925), viii and 200 pp.
28. On seasonal migration within Hungary see Mecartney, *Hungary and her Successors*, p. 237; an American analysis of some positive features of temporary nature of Austro-Hungarian, Italian, and other migrations of that time is W. B. Bailey, "The Bird of Passage," *American Journal of Sociology*, XVIII, no. 3 (November, 1912), 391-397.
29. Cf. the annual statistics for 1899-1913 compiled by the Slovak demographer Tajtak; see his, "Pereslennja Ukrainians Sxidnoji Slovaccyny do 1913 r." ("The Emigration of Ukrainians from Eastern Slovakia before 1913") *Dukla*, IX, no. 4 (1961), 101.
 See also his presentation of the annual Hungarian statistics on emigration and immigration for Eastern Slovakia which do not treat Carpatho-Ruthenians separately; Ladislav Tajtak, "Vychodoslovenske vyst'ahovalectvo do prvej svetovej vojny, ("Eastern Slovak Emigration before the First World War") *Nove obzory*, III (1961), 239.
30. United States Immigration Commission, *Abstract of Reports of the Immigration Commission*, vol. I, (Washington : Government Printing Office, 1911), p. 113.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 113.
32. Hadakkuk, "Family Structure and Economic Change," p. 9.
33. Betty Boyd Caroli, *Italian Repatriation from the United States, 1900-1914* (New York : Center for Migration Studies, 1973), p. 11; p. 38.
 See the statement of Theodore Saloutos on the recession of 1907 as a stimulus for the repatriation of Greeks in his, *They Remember America: The Story of the Repatriated Greek Americans* (Berkeley and Los Angeles ; University of California Press, 1956), p. 32.
34. Cf. Betty Boyd Caroli, *Italian Repatriation*, viii & 110 pp.; Francesco P. Cerase, "A Study of Italian Migrants Returning from the U. S. A., "International Migration Review, I, n. s., no. 3 (Summer, 1967), 67-74; Cerase, "Expectations and Reality: A Case Study of Return Migration from the

- United States to Southern Italy," *loc. cit.*, VIII, no. 2 (Summer, 1974), 245-262; Watraut Feindt and Harvey L. Browning, "Return Migration: Its Significance in an Industrial Metropolis and an Agricultural Town in Mexico," *loc. cit.*, VI, no. 2 (Summer, 1972), 158-165.
35. On the difficulties the Greek Catholic emigre priests had with the Latin-rite authorities see, Gerald P. Fogarty, "The American Hierarchy and Oriental Rite Catholics, 1890-1907," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, CXXXV, no. 1 (March-June, 1974), 17-28; also, Bohdan P. Procko, "The Establishment of the Ruthenian Church in the United States," *Pennsylvania History*, XLII, no. 2 (April, 1975), 137-154.
 36. On the theme of cultural pluralism facilitating long-term assimilation cf., Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, "The Integration of Puerto Ricans," *Thought*, XXX, no. 118 (Autumn, 1955), 402-420.
 37. Robert F. Foerster *The Italian Emigration of our Times* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919), p. 43.
 38. United States Immigration Commission, *Abstracts of Reports*, vol. I, p. 97.
 39. Peter Roberts, "The New Pittsburghers: Slavs and Kindred Immigrants in Pittsburgh," *Charities and the Commons*, XXI (2 January, 1909), 535-536.
 40. A Marxist writer has presented statistics on the tiny land-holdings of Carpatho-Ruthenian peasant in comparison with other groups in 1900; cf. Maria Mayer, "A XIX szazadvegi karpatukran agrarnepesseg tarsadalmi szerkezetek statisztikai abrazolasa," ("A Statistical Description of the Social Structure of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Agrarian Population at the End of the Nineteenth century"), *Tortenelmi szemle*, IV, no. 3 (1961), 330-346.
 41. United States Immigration Commission, *Abstracts of Reports*, vol. I, p. 99.
 42. "Kivandorlása és visszavandorlása a Magyar szent Korona országainak, 1899-1913," ("Emigration and Return of Emigres of the Nations of the Holy Hungarian Crown from 1899 to 1913") in *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, CXVII, new series (Budapest: Anonymous Publishing Society of Pest, 1918), p. 36.
 43. Cf. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, "The Importance of 'Community' in the Process of Immigrant Assimilation," *International Migration Review*, I, no. 1 (Fall, 1966), 5-16.
 44. For a compilation of Carpatho-Ruthenian organizations consult, Lubomyr R. Wynar, *Encyclopedic Directory of Ethnic Organizations in the United States* (Littleton, Colo.; Libraries Unlimited, 1975), pp. 69-72.
 45. The respected University of Chicago sociologist Robert Ezra Park noted the functions of immigrant aid societies for strengthening communal life. See Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller, *Old World Traits Transplanted* (New York: Harper, 1921), pp. 124-132.

For a discussion of the issues of cultural assimilation and adjustment see, Yaroslav J. Chyz and Read Lewis, "Agencies Organized by Nationality Groups in the United States," *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, CXLII (March, 1949), 157-158.

78 CARPATHO-RUTHENIAN RESOURCES & ASSIMILATION, 1880-1924

46. Margaret F. Byington, *Homestead: The Households of a Mill Town* (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910), pp. 160-164; 271-276.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 163-164.
49. For information on currently published Carpatho-Ruthenian newspapers consult Lubomyr R. Wynar *Encyclopedic Directory of Ethnic Newspapers and Periodicals in the United States* (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1972), pp. 35-38.

The Immigration History Research Center of the University of Minnesota is now completing a microfilming project of Carpatho-Ruthenian immigrant serials; "Carpatho-Ruthenian Project Nears Completion" *Spectrum*, II, no. 3 (December, 1976), 8.

On Carpatho-Ruthenian periodicals stored in selected libraries see, Edward Kasinec, "The Carpatho-Ruthenian Immigration in the United States, A Note on Sources in some U. S. Repositories, *Queens Slavic Papers*, II (1977), forthcoming.

50. This paper, now called *Greek Catholic Union Messenger*, is the organ of the Greek Catholic Union. On the rôle of this society in promoting national consciousness among the American immigrants see, Faul R. Magocsi, "The Political Activity of Rusyn-American Immigrants in 1918," *East European Quarterly*, X, no. 3 (Fall, 1976), 345-365.
51. On this general theme see, Robert E. Park, *The Immigrant Press and its Control* (New York: Harper, 1922), pp. 33-40.
52. U. S. Immigration Commission *Immigrants in Industries*, part 23, vol. I, p. 150.
53. *Loc. cit.*, XXI
54. A history of the American Carpatho-Ruthenian Church is contained in Walter C. Warzeski, *Byzantine Rite Rusins in Carpatho-Ruthenia and America* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1971), x and 332 pp.
55. Robert Clement, "The Life of the Married Eastern Clergy," *Eastern Churches Review*, II (Spring, 1968), 64.
56. Andrew Perejda, "Geographic Settlement Patterns", in Renoff and Reynolds, *Proceedings*, p. 44.
57. The research of Professor Perejda should do much to illuminate this topic; see, *ibid.*, pp. 43-48.
58. On Slavic trade union activity in the Pennsylvania anthracite region consult, Victor R. Greene, *The Slavic Community on Strike: Immigrant Labor in Pennsylvania Anthracite* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), XVI and 260 pp.
59. Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor, 1957), pp. 74-110.

5

The Ukrainian Community in Ohio 1885-1976

G. KULCHYCKY

A. Introduction

The Ukrainian-Americans are presently celebrating the Centennial of the mass emigration of Ukrainians to the United States. From all the accumulated data and new information, however, there is no longer any doubt that the Ukrainian emigration to the United States is much older than 100 years. Evidence points to early Ukrainian presence in Virginia, with Captain Smith and Lord Delaware, the Aleutians, Alaska and California.¹

The coming of Ukrainian immigrants to Ohio is more recent. Their arrival here is probably no older than 1880 and probably the first settler was S. Motko who came to Youngstown in 1885 from the village of Lupukhiv, Western Ukraine. After him came other immigrants from the region of Lisko, Sianik, Sambir, Rava Ruska, Dobromyl, Skalat, Ternopil and other areas of Western Ukraine.² A sizeable number came also from the Carpathian region. Attracted by jobs and opportunity for advancement, many Ukrainians drifted west and by 1900 began to settle in Akron and Cleveland. The first Ukrainians to arrive in the latter were S. Palivoda and P. Voliansky in 1886. Since that time Cleveland has become the nerve center of over 37 Ukrainian settlements in Ohio.³

B. The Old and New Immigrants

The "Old Immigration," as it is called, refers to the mass emigration of Ukrainians between 1876 and 1939. Whether this is the correct nomenclature is still to be debated.⁴ It is this group of "Old Immigrants" who bore the brunt of the difficulties encountered in a strange new land called America. They prepared the ground for the massive "New Immigration" which was to come between 1945 and 1954.

The "Old Immigrants" came to the United States mostly from Western Ukraine which was then under Austria-Hungary. For the most part these immigrants were Ukrainian (Byzantine) or Greek Catholics and of poor peasant stock. Their emigration was due to economic rather than political reasons. Many of the immigrants had no intention of staying in America. Their objective was to earn money and return to the Ukraine. World War I shattered the hopes of the would be returnees and forced them to establish deeper roots in the American soil. Hard working, enterprising, and determined, the Ukrainian immigrants began to overcome the obstacles that faced them.

First, the immigrants created fraternal and self help organizations which had the economic well being of its members in mind. From these organizations, since most of the members were Ukrainian (Byzantine) Catholic, came the initiative to build Churches. In both of these endeavors the Ukrainians encountered internal and external opposition. Internally, the Ukrainians were divided among themselves (Ruthenians and Ukrainian Galitsians); the Church hierarchy was in disorder and in the process of being formed. Within this hierarchy there was a power struggle between Ruthenian and Ukrainian Galitsian priests which eventually led to a split. In the purely Ukrainian Churches there was a rapid turnover of priests and a struggle between them and the parishioners.⁵ Added to this was the intrusion of Roman Catholic prelates into purely Ukrainian Church affairs as well as the activity of the Russian Mission which conducted a wide propaganda campaign, which appealed to Ukrainian Russophile elements, and in this way contributed to the split in the Ukrainian Catholic Church.⁶ Finally, the Depression as well as the growth of the progressive (communist) wing of Ukrainian immigrants further complicated the progress of the "Old Immigrants".

The "Old Immigrants" were able to overcome the challenges. Not very well educated, due to long hours of toil, they were not able to master the English language by going to night school. Nevertheless, their achievements in a span of a little over 50 years are remarkable. They were, first of all, strong enough to overcome the problems facing them and then proceeded to build churches, found fraternal insurance companies, national homes, Ukrainian schools, political, cultural and social organizations, businesses, youth and women organizations, newspapers and printing presses, and much more. Through their efforts and financial self sacrifice the Ukrainian immigrants created a "fortress" and base on which a new wave of Ukrainian immigrants could, under new and different circumstances, thrive, expand, and operate.

The "New Immigrants" or those who came after 1945 had many advantages not enjoyed by the "Old Immigrants". They were better educated, politically more sophisticated, and most important, they did not have to begin their existence from nothing, as was the case of the previous immigrants.

The Displaced Persons Act passed by Congress in 1948 opened the gates to a new wave of immigrants. In the case of the Ukrainians the "New Immigrants" came to America for political rather than economic reasons. Different from the "Old Immigrants" this new wave also included persons from Eastern as well as Western Ukraine.⁷

Not feeling the social pressures experienced by the "Old Immigrants", the new arrivals retain and are proud to maintain their bilingualism as well as their original names. Proud of their nationality and rejecting the "melting-pot" theory they cling to their national traditions and customs. Unlike the first emigres they came mostly from large cities and had an easier adjustment period. They became citizens faster and their upward mobility, despite their initial language deficiency, was and continues to be substantial.

It is difficult to ascertain what the number of Ukrainians or American-Ukrainians is in Ohio. By 1930, based on the Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, there were 10,169 Ukrainians in Ohio.⁸ This number cannot be accepted at face value in that many Ukrainians entering this area were counted as Poles, Austrians or Russians. In local areas such as Cleve-

land and Youngstown information as to numbers is conflicting. In Cleveland the Don Levy Report places Ukrainians at 16,500; the work of Dr. Z. Wynnycky places them at 25,000 in 1961, while Halychin puts them at 26,719 in 1936.⁹ In Youngstown, Halychin puts the figure at 6,730; P. Yasnovsky places the Ukrainian figure at 9,000 in 1936; the area Chamber of Commerce places the figure at 1,899 in 1970, while Atty. M. Yurchison places the number at 15,000.¹⁰ In total, based on interviews and projection of areas of settlement, it would probably be safe to say that there are about 64 to 65 thousand Ukrainians in Ohio.¹¹

C. *Ukrainians and Religion in Ohio*

1884 to 1933 was the period of Church building. At first the Ukrainians of Ohio had to rely upon the good graces of Roman or Byzantine Catholic priests of non-Ukrainian origin to allow them to say mass or worship in their churches. In Cleveland services were begun in 1902 in a trolley car garage.¹² In that year the Clevelanders asked Bishop S. Ortynsky, first prelate of Ukrainians in America, to organize a Church. Shortly thereafter a split occurred and the Ukrainian Carpatho-Ruthenians and Galitsians of Cleveland divided the money between themselves and began building their own churches. The Ruthenians began building the Holy Ghost Church and the Galitsians began construction of the Sts. Peter and Paul Parish in 1909. The first priest of the latter was Father J. Chaplynsky and its first pastor was Father V. Dohovycz.

After 1910 the importance of the Sts. Peter and Paul Church grew. Subsequent pastors founded an orphanage, later transferred to Philadelphia and bought land for the construction of new churches, a cemetery, and picnic grounds. In 1949 the cornerstone for a school was laid in Parma at a cost of \$ 300,000 and the St. Josaphat Chapel, which became an independent parish in 1959. On the East Side of Cleveland St. Mary's Parish was established in 1952 and built in 1956. In 1958 yet another church, St. Andrew's was founded in Parma. Finally, because of religious disputes with Rome over the calendar, and the creation of a Ukrainian Patriarchate, a quasi-independent Catholic Church of the Ascension was founded in the 1960s.

By virtue of its population, as well as church building

activity, Cleveland became the centre of Ukrainian religious life. The Ohio Deanery under Msgr. D. Gresko, also pastor of Sts. Peter and Paul, is to be found here.

In Youngstown the early immigrants attended St. Mary's Byzantine Catholic Church before beginning construction of their own in 1909. By 1911 the church was built under Fr. Zatserkowny. In the 1920s, like most other Ukrainian churches, the Holy Trinity Parish went through a turbulent period of existence which resulted in a split and the creation of St. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Orthodox Church. In 1933 under Fr. I. Zabava, also once a pastor of the Holy Ghost Church in Akron, order was restored. During the Depression the church had its financial problems but overcame them and shortly bought land in Austintown where a mission and school were established. In 1974 St. Ann, the former mission, became an independent parish. In addition to its church buildings the parishes have picnic grounds, a functioning school where Ukrainian is taught and other properties.

In Rossford, St. Michael's parish was established in 1912 and erected only in 1949. The church is small but conducts classes for 25 pupils. Presently the pastor is Rev. P. Guthrie.

In Akron the Holy Ghost Church was founded and built in 1916. Prior to this the Ukrainians from 1909 attended the Slovak Church where mass was said by a Ukrainian priest from Cleveland. In 1912 the Carpatho-Ruthenian Church was erected and many Ukrainians joined it. By 1914 they began collecting funds for their own Church which was finally blessed by Bishop C. Bohachevsy in 1925. Subsequent problems with finances, growth of a progressive movement which caused a split in the church, and the rapid turnover of pastors led to a weakening of the parish¹³. Nevertheless the Church overcame these problems and in 1946 bought lots for the construction of a new Church. To strengthen the parish several hundred affidavits were prepared to bring new immigrants to Akron. In 1952, a new emigree, Fr. I. Durbak became pastor. Under him church organizations were reconstituted and a new Church was built in 1961. The Church over the years has also had Ukrainian classes for its young.

The Canton, Ohio Ukrainian community also has its church which was founded in 1952 and completed in 1954. The pastor

of St. Nicholas Parish is Fr. W. Pellich.

Together the Catholic churches number eleven, the last five of which were founded after 1948 with the arrival of the "New Immigrants". Most of these churches have their own organizations, schools, choirs, "pyrohy projects" and bingo.

The Church struggle in the 1920s resulted in the strengthening of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church which was organized in 1918. The members of this Church were mainly former Catholics who for many reasons left the Church.¹⁴

There are six Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in Ohio. The first, Sts. Peter and Paul Parish, was built in Youngstown in 1924 and the second, St. Vladimir's, which is 1966 was relocated to Parma, was built in Cleveland in 1926. The latter is a landmark in Parma and is built in the "Kozak Barocco" architectural style with golden domes. Other Orthodox Churches in Cleveland are smaller both in size and membership and include St. Nicholas, Holy Trinity, and St. Andrew Parishes. St. Mary's Orthodox parish is in Lorain. The Orthodox parishes sponsor a Ukrainian Saturday School, "Ridna Shkola", for their young, they, like the Catholic Churches, have their own choirs, picnic grounds, sisterhoods and other organizations. Three of the Orthodox churches were organized after the coming of the "New Immigrants".

D. Fraternal, Business, Professional, Financial, and Self-Help Organizations

Having come to America the "Old Immigrants" settled in areas close to people with whom they could associate and communicate. Thus Ukrainians settled in neighborhoods where the dominant population was Slav. This tended to cushion the culture shock experienced by the emigrees. The next step was to create a financial or economic cushion. To protect themselves from death, accidents and maiming the emigrees established the Ukrainian National Association (UNA) in 1894, the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association in 1911, the Association of Ukrainian Catholics in America, "Provedinnia", in 1912 and the Ukrainian National Aids Association of America (UNP) in 1915. All four of these fraternal organizations continue to exist and thrive. It is the fraternal organizations that are mainly responsible for founding churches and providing low interest loan for their construction. They were

also important in founding Ukrainian National Homes, newspapers, scholarships, and many cultural and political organizations and projects.

The UNA organized its first branch in Cleveland in 1902. In 1943 this insurance organization had 9 branches in that city with a membership of 2,027.¹⁵ Today the number of branches has grown to 14 with a membership of over 5,000. The branches are coordinated by the UNA Regional Council. Other fraternal organizations found in Cleveland are seven branches of the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association; five branches of the "Providence" Association and five branches of the Ukrainian National Aid Association.¹⁶

Youngstown also has similar fraternal organizations, the first of which was Branch 140 of the UNA founded in 1906. Today the UNA in Youngstown has six branches, the National Aid Association has two and "Providence" has one. Akron, Ohio like the previous cities maintains two branches of the UNA and one "Providence" branch; Lorain has one branch of the UNA; Rossford has 2 branches of the UNA; Toledo has two branches of the UNA; Canton has one branch of the UNA, one of the National Aid Association and one of Providence; Zanesville and Yorkville each have one branch of the UNA. Together the Ukrainian fraternal organizations in Ohio number 53 branches.

As far as businesses and professions are concerned, the first business to be established in Cleveland was a dairy run by Mr. W. Momryk in 1903.¹⁷ Other businesses included groceries, meat markets, beer parlors, etc. In 1934 Cleveland had 71 Ukrainian businesses one of which employed 41 workers.¹⁸

The professional field grew very rapidly. In 1933 a Ukrainian Professional Association of America was created and headed by Cleveland Attorney O. Miles. As new emigrees came to America Engineering and Medical Societies were founded. Ohio membership is 45 and 65 respectively. Several doctors from Cleveland became presidents of the national organization. All the professions are united into the Cleveland Professional Society which includes as its members 200 of 500 Cleveland professionals.

Youngstown is the second most important city in Ohio in terms of professions. Here also are to be found doctors, law-

yers, professors, and other professionals. A long time Chief of Police and later Chief of Detectives of the City was J. Terlesky. Others include Dr. I. Dombczevsky director and superintendent of the Mahoning County TB Hospital and Clinic; P. Leseganich Director of District 26 of the USWA; J. C. Melnick, President of the Mahoning County Medical Society and author; Assistant Coroner and now Sheriff of Mahoning County M. Yarosh; J. Naberezny, Chairman of the Youngstown State University Art Department and many others.

The recently published work *Ukrainians in North America* lists 72 persons of note from Ohio. These figures do not, however, reflect the true membership of professions in this state.²⁰

In the financial field the Ukrainian Ohians have also been moderately successful. In 1915 the first Ukrainian Savings and Loan Association was founded in Cleveland. The bank survived the Depression and expanded in the 1960's into N. Royalton and Parma. In 1967 it merged with the present Cardinal Savings and Loan Association. In the 1950s two Ukrainian Credit Unions were formed, the "Selfreliance" and "Osnova". These credit unions have assets in the millions and in addition to giving loans to its members, finance cultural activities, aid invalids and give scholarships to needy students.

Two other Ukrainian Credit Unions exist in Ohio. The first was organized in Youngstown but its center was later transferred to Canton. Today Youngstown maintains only a branch. The other Credit Union is in Lorain and has assets of over half a million dollars.²¹

Remembering their own plight the Ukrainian immigrants in Ohio continue to support Ukrainian charitable and self help organizations. During the 1930s hundreds of thousands of dollars were sent to Ukraine to assist in church and hospital building, invalids, political prisoners and war victims. Almost every larger city in Ohio had its branches of the United Ukrainian-American Relief Committee (ZUDAK). This committee sends aid in time of emergencies to such close areas as flood victims in Pennsylvania and such distant areas as earthquake victims in Bania Luka in Yugoslavia.

E. Politics and Political Life

Since man is basically a political animal, it was a matter of

time before the Ukrainian immigrants, after tending to their economic well being, would engage in political activity. They were not indifferent to the plight of their brethren in the "Old Country". This was evident from the bond drive benefitting the government of the Western Ukrainian National Republic (ZUNR) in the early 1920s, the financial aid given to Ukrainian institutions under the Polish regime, the formation of organizations specifically concerned about the future of Ukraine and attempts to create central organizations that would channel and coordinate Ukrainian activity in the United States for the benefit of Ukraine.

Examples of the attempt to coordinate activity in Ohio are the creation of the United Ukrainian Organizations in Cleveland in 1928 and the "Samopomich" or "Self Help" in Akron. These types of coordinating bodies emerged spontaneously in every city that had a large Ukrainian population. It was not until December 2, 1939 at its 8th Congress that the loosely knit "Union of Ukrainian Organizations of America" decided to create a viable body that could speak as one voice for all Ukrainians. This was especially necessary since the clouds of war were gathering over the world. Such a body was founded in Washington in May of 1940 by 805 delegates representing 168 localities and 2,000 Ukrainian organizations in America.²²

Each city now had a branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as it was called, which was to be a representative and political body coordinating the activities of all organizations that belonged to it. Ohio has seven such branches. In the Cleveland branch of this organization there are 40 dues paying member organizations while in Youngstown there are 36.²³ The number of politically oriented member organizations reflects the variety of interests among the Ukrainians. In reality there are only several ideological persuasions that have dominated the allegiance of the emigres but each one of these ideologies has several sister organizations, *i. e.*, youth, women's cultural, etc., which have their own vote but at the same time follow the general ideological line.

Before the creation of the UCCA each city did pretty much what it felt was the correct line. In time a "general line" was adopted thanks to the efforts of such Ukrainian diplomats as L. Cehelsky and Bachynsky who continued to struggle for the by

then occupied Ukraine. Their travels and speeches did much to enlighten the Ukrainians in America and were responsible for generous financial aid first to the ZUNR delegation and its political activities in Paris, and later to the Church and other worthwhile organizations and projects in Ukraine. Financial ledger books are replete with examples of aid to Ukraine. In Youngstown, for example, the Ukrainians since 1931 have had a Ukrainian Day. The money earned at these events, sponsored by the United Ukrainian Organizations, (today UNA) were sent to Ukraine. Thus in 1933, during the height of the Depression, they sent \$ 40·35, in 1937 of the \$ 556·88 made \$ 456·88 was sent to Ukraine, in 1938 out of \$ 621·73 made \$ 457·73 was sent to Ukraine²⁴. During the war years much money was channelled into the war effort in the form of Red Cross contributions, bond buying as well as Ukrainian national projects in the United States. After the war much money was channelled into aid and affidavits for the displaced persons.²⁶

In almost every city of Ohio there existed political organizations such as the Organization for the Liberation of Ukraine (ODWU), the Hetmanate organization (monarchical) and the progressives who united themselves into the 'Order of Workers' whose centers were labour temples such as the one that still exists in Cleveland. The ODWU and Hetmanate organizations were nationalist and had their paramilitary youth, and women's organizations. They fought against the progressives and finally were able to prevail thanks to the 'New Immigrants' who were able to convince the 'progressives' that things were not as rosy as Soviet propaganda would have them believe²⁷. An example of the hostility among the ideological camps can be seen in the action of a young emigre who during the "Opportunity Fair" in 1964 in Cleveland tore down the Soviet Ukrainian flag from the hands of the progressives and destroyed it. This act resulted in the arrest of the young man and the placing of two detectives as a permanent guard of the Soviet flag.²⁸ The Progressive movement was very strong in Cleveland which in its formidable years was its center and published the *Worker*.

With the coming of the "New Immigrants" the nationalistic spirit prevailed in organized Ukrainian life. Especially active was the Ukrainian Liberation Front and its affiliates. Ukrainians

who belong to the UCCA pay their dues to the "National Fund" and the UCCA with its branches holds political, mainly patriotic, anti-Communist rallies, commemorate "Captive Nations Week", the "Bicentennial", provide speakers for meetings of different types, and initiate projects such as the erection of the T. Shevchenko monument in Washington and the L. Ukrainka monument in the Cultural Gardens of Cleveland. At the Tenth Congress of the UCCA held in New York in 1974, three Ohio branches of the UCCA were lauded for their accomplishments. The branches were Cleveland, Youngstown and Canton.²⁹

But the Ukrainians have also become very active in American politics. Political Clubs exist in Youngstown, Toledo, Cleveland and other cities. The "Old" and "New Immigrants" differ in their political preferences in that the former lean mostly to the Democrats and the latter prefer the Republicans. Not satisfied to see their representatives just once every four years during elections, the Ukrainians entered political life in Ohio and have captured such positions as the Mayor of Parma and Middleburgh Heights. They took an active part in the Parma charter commission bid, and recently had their candidates for mayor and Congress in the Parma-Cleveland Area. Presently there are several candidates running for different positions in Ohio. The problem that exists in the area of American politics is that many of the new aggressive young Ukrainian politicians and candidates have run into opposition from old loyal political stalwarts of Ukrainian descent who feel that each candidate should start from the very bottom and work himself up to the top in party hierarchy. The younger Ukrainian politicians, however, are impatient as well as aggressive and are therefore winning new adherents.

F. Education and Culture

Since the coming of the "Old Immigrants" the question of education has always dominated the center of the stage. Many of these who came to America were illiterate, but nevertheless, recognized the importance of education. To raise the level of literacy, organizations such as "Prosvita" (Enlightenment) were founded. These organizations had their own libraries as well as instruction. The Church and the deacons also played an immense role in education. Evening, Saturday and Sunday Schools taught the Ukrainian language, history and other subjects. With the

coming of the "New Immigrants" a network of schools known as "Ridna Shkola" (native school) was organized in America and Ohio. Cleveland has two such schools. Youngstown, Akron, Canton and other areas have had such schools but due to a lack of teachers their existence continues to be sporadic in nature. These schools over the years have turned out thousands of students. At the end of the 1974-75 school year Cleveland graduated 246 students.³⁰ Standards for graduation and instruction are set up by the UCCA Educational Council and adherence to these standards is periodically examined by regional school inspectors.

The emphasis on higher education in the Ukrainian community is very great. Almost every college or university has Ukrainian students. Over the years student clubs were organized in such universities as Toledo, Kent, Youngstown, Ohio State and in the Cleveland area which served four universities. It is the Cleveland Student Club, "Adam Kotsko", which is responsible for the initiative in 1953 that culminated in the creation of the Ukrainian Student Federation of America (SUSTA). Two presidents of SUSTA came from Cleveland. The city is also known for the Third Congress of SUSTA at which the idea of a permanent "Ukrainian Chair" at an American University was born. Moneys were collected for this project (FKU) which finally led to the creation of a Ukrainian Chair at Harvard. Cleveland has contributed \$ 230,000; Lorin, \$ 50,000; Youngstown, \$ 21,000; Akron, \$ 5,000.³¹ Smaller Ukrainian settlements have also contributed to the Fund.

Ukrainians in Ohio have many scholarly organizations. Almost every city of settlement has either a branch or members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society or the Free Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences. The Shevchenko Scientific Society of Ohio presently has 60 members.³² Cleveland has a Ukrainian Museum founded in 1952. It is known for its excellent T. Shevchenko collection as well as Ukrainian Boy Scout (Plast) Archives. Periodically the Museum turns out commemorative stamps and publishes catalogues and materials relating to the Ukrainian press.³³ An important centre of Ukrainian learning is Kent State University where the journal *The Ukrainian Historian* is published. University Libraries at Youngstown State, Case Western Reserve, Kent State, John Carroll and Ohio State have

good if not excellent collections of *Ukrainica*. Presently almost every university in Ohio has professors of Ukrainian descent who are organized in the Ukrainian American Association of University Professors. Over the years many books have been published in many fields in Ohio by such Ukrainian printing concerns as the Klym Co., West Side and Baturyn companies.

Ohio excels in the field of culture. Perhaps the crowning achievement of the Ukrainians of Ohio was the opening of the Ukrainian Cultural Gardens in Cleveland in 1939. The Gardens are located on Liberty Boulevard on land donated by the Rockefellers in 1925 and contain statues sculped by the renowned Ukrainian sculptor, A. Archipenko, one of the founders of cubism. The cost of the Ukrainian Gardens from 1935 to 1939 was \$ 13,027.³⁴ In 1969 another statue, the work of M. Chereshniowsky of Lesia Ukrainka, the poetess, was added to the priceless bronzes in the Garden.

Proud of their rich heritage, Ukrainians proceeded to organize cultural projects which would identify their nationality. The first theater group was founded in 1903 in Cleveland and lasted until 1950. Folk dancing groups were organized under the renowned balletmaster Vasyl Avramenko in 1926. Musical societies, schools and choirs were begun, the two most prominent of which have been the Taras Shevchenko "Homin" Chorus and the "Dnipro" Chorus conducted by the late Jaroslaw Barnych and Eugene Sadowsky respectively. The Ukrainian Musical Institute (UMI) was founded in the 1950's. Percussion, Mandolin, and Bandura (the Ukrainian national instrument) ensembles were also organized.

During 1976 the Ukrainians of Ohio have participated in the American Bicentennial celebrations through their committees. Such committees were organized in Cleveland, Youngstown, Akron, Lorain, Canton, and Toledo. Two of the cities, Cleveland and Youngstown, besides having gala festivals and concerts dedicated to the 200th Anniversary of American Independence and 100th Anniversary of Ukrainian Settlement in America, had their own national floats. Present at the Youngstown celebration was Miss A. Ilschenko, Miss World USA, a Ukrainian from Middleburgh Heights, Ohio.

G. Conclusion

The Ukrainian American community of Ohio continues to be a viable, active, growing group that plays a vital role in the overall Ukrainian community of America. Even though proud of their ethnic heritage they do not forget their debt to America. They are good, hard working, loyal citizens who have over the years given their support as well as their sons for the country of their choosing. Valuing liberty they remain a stabilizing factor in the sometimes complex and radical changes that have beset America. Together with other ethnic groups, through the electoral process as well as the media, they stand on guard of the liberties that they have obtained and continue to cherish here in America.

FOOTNOTES

1. L. Myshuha, "Over Half a Century in the New World," *Propamiatna Knyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soiuzy* (Jersey City, New Jersey: Published by "Svoboda," 1944) p. 2. See also W. Halich's *Ukrainians in the United States* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937) pp. 19-22; T. Bodnaruk's "Slidamy Andriia Ahapiia Honcharenka" and V. Savchenko's "Zaporozhtsi v Ameryci to ikh Oboronets o. Ahapii Honcharenko" both in *Vyzvolnyi Sliakh*, Vol. XIX, No. 4 (217), (April, 1966) pp. 436 to 436 to 446.
2. Dr. Luke Myshuha (ed.), *Propamiatna Knyha Vydana z Nahody Soroklitnoh Iuvileiu Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soiuzu*, (Jersey City N. J.: Published by the UNA, 1936), p. 671.
3. Dmytro M. Shtohry (ed.) *Ukrainians in North America*, (Champaign, Illinois: Association for the Advancement of Ukrainian Studies, 1975). Based on the names included in this work, Ukrainians are presently living in the following cities of Ohio: Cleveland, Newburgh Heights, Cleveland Heights, Lakewood, Bedford, Strongsville, Brooklyn, Lakewood, Parma, Seven Hills, Niles, Girard, Youngtown, Lorain, Akron Barberton, Ravenna, Canton, Rossford, Toledo, Columbus, Cincinnati, Zanesville, Dayton, Troy, Kent, Campbell, New Richland, Wapakoneta, Macedonia, Findley, Oxford, Greenville, Lima, Yorkville, Jefferson and Mansfield. According to W. Halich's, *Ukrainians in the United States*, (Chicago: University Press, 1937) p. 157, Ukrainians lived or live in Ashtabula, Burton, Belle Valley, Blaine, Byesville, Empire, Fairport Harbor, Kipling, Marblehead, Masury, Mingo Pleasant City, Struthers, and Warren.
4. One could divide the Ukrainian emigration to America into five waves:
 1. 17th century to 1876—mostly political

2. 1876-1914— first mass emigration— mostly economic
 3. 1918-1939— political-economic. Very influential in forming the political outlook of their predecessors
 4. 1945-1954— second mass emigration— mostly political.
 5. 1954 to present— economic— resettled from Poland, Argentina and the Ukrainian SSR.
5. V. Lesniak (ed.), *Golden Anniversary 1915-1965 of the Holy Ghost Ukrainian Catholic Church in Akron, Ohio*, n. p. See also *44th Annual Ukrainian Day Program* (Youngstown, August 10, 1975), n. p.
6. Lesniak, *ibid.*, p. n. p.
7. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America consisted of former Catholics who were dissatisfied with the politics of Rome and left the Church. Most of these Western Ukrainians came from Austria-Hungary. After WWII, E. Ukrainians arrived in America and were representative of Ukrainian Orthodoxy. For the origin of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, see Rev. Peter Bilon, *Ukrainians and Their Church* (Johnston, Pa.: Published by Western Pennsylvanian Regional Branch of the UOL, 1953). n. p.
8. W. Halych, "Rozmischennia Ukrainskoi Imigracii v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh," *Propamiatna Knyha*, *op. cit.*, p. 454.
9. Don Levy, "Metropolitan Ethnic Population," This information is based on information obtained from the Nationality Services Center in Cleveland. n. p. See also Z Wynnytsky's, *The Cle elanders of Ukrainian Descent* (Cleveland: The Ukrainian United Organization of Cleveland, Ohio, 1961) n. p. W. Halych, *Propamiatna*, *op. cit.*, p. 455.
10. Halychyn, *Ibid.*, p. 455. See also Pylyp Iasnovskyi's, *Pid Ridnym i Pid Chuzhym Nebom*, (Buenos Aires: Published by Julian Serediak, 1961) p. 322; Howard C Aley, *A Heritage to Share*, (Youngstown: Published by the Bicentennial Commission of Youngstown and Mahoning County, 1975), p. 55. Interview with Atty. M. Yurchison, President of the Youngstown UCCA Branch, (October, 1975).
11. This estimated figure is reached on the basis of talks with community leaders who claim that the Ukrainian population of the larger cities in Ohio is as follows: Cleveland, 35,000; Youngstown, 15,000; Akron, 1,000; Parma, 5,000; Rossford-Toledo, 700; Lorain, 500; Canton, 600; Cincinnati, 150 and all the other settlements approximately 50 or more.
12. *Sliakh* (The Way), December 7, 1960.
13. Lesniak, *op. cit.*, n. p.
14. Bilon, *op. cit.*, n. p.
15. Roman Slobodian, "Tse ne Mertvi Chysla: Tse Zhyva Syla," *Golden Jubilee Almanac of the UNA* (Jersey City, N. J. Published by the UNA, 1946) p. 44.

16. George P. Kulchycky, "Ukrainians in Greater Cleveland," *Ukrainian Festival of Songs and Dances: A Bicentennial Salute of the Ukrainian Community of Greater Cleveland* (May 23, 1967), n. p.
17. Wynnytsky, *op. cit.*, n. p.
18. Halich, *Ukrainians ... , op. cit.*, p. 66.
19. Michael S. Pap (ed.), "The Ukrainian Community of Cleveland" *Ethnic Communities of Cleveland*, (Cleveland: Institute for Soviet and East European Studies : John Carroll University, 1973) p. 309.
20. Shtohrynn, *op. cit.*, The total number of Ukrainians from Ohio comes to 72. This figure is incorrect. Since the effort of Dr. Shtohrynn is new it is probable that many noteworthy Ukrainians from Ohio were not included in the publication. I know 19 persons personally that should have been included but were not. Finally just one organization, the Medical Society, has 65 physicians.
21. V. Deychakivsky, Interview of June, 1976. Lorain, Ohio.
22. Anon. *Three Decades of UCCA : 1940-1970*, (New York, N. Y., Published by "Svoboda," 1970), p. 1.
23. Roster of Ukrainian Organizations in UZO. See also *44th Annual Ukrainian Day Program* (Youngstown, Ohio, August 10, 1975) n. p.
24. Anon, *Knyha Prykhodiv to Rozkhodiv Ukrainskoho Dnia 1931 do 1955*, (Youngstown, Ohio : unpublished financial reports pp. 6-7, 12 and 13.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19 and p. 34.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.
27. M. Nastasivsky, *Ukrainska Imigraciia v Spoluchenykh Derzhavakh*, (New York : Soiuz Ukrainskykh Robitnychkh Orhanizatsiy 1934). See also A. M. Shlepakov, *Ukrainska Trudova Emigraciia v SShA i Kanadi*, (Kyiv, Akademiiia Nauk Ukrainskoi RSR, 1960), p. 107.
28. George P. Kulchycky, Private notes dated 5-24-1964., p. 1.
29. *Three Decades of UCCA ... , op cit.*, p. 17.
30. Based on the unpublished UZO report of July, 1975 to the UCCA in New York. Exhibit D : "The School of Ukrainian Studies," n. p.
31. Reports of V. Deychakivsky of Lorain and M. Lischak of Youngstown, June, 1976. Both are responsible for fund raising in their respective cities.
32. This information is from an unpublished roster of members.
33. So far they have turned out 18 such catalogues. The last one was published in 1975.
34. George P. Kulchycky, *The Ukrainian Community of Cleveland* written in Cleveland in 1964 : unpublished, n. p.

6

The Early Russian Feminists and The Struggle for Higher Education for Women

RUTH A. DUDGEON

"Women are created to be slaves all their lives and nothing can be done about it."¹ Thus, Ekaterina Zhukovskaia's mother counselled her at the beginning of the 1860's. Yet Ekaterina and a number of her contemporaries— as well as a few of her mother's contemporaries— broke with this traditional view in the 1860's and demanded an end to slavery and inequality.

The purposes of this paper are to define women's struggle for independence and equality in 19th century Russia and to demonstrate the central role played in that struggle by the movement for higher education for women.

The reform era in Russia generated a number of social and economic pressures to examine the position of women, pressures which were reinforced by Western influences. The "woman question" was first delineated in the pages of *Sovremennik* in the late 1850's by Mikhail Mikhailov,² and the discussion was quickly taken up by other journals and by society. Educational reform, including co-education was proposed. The oppressed condition of women was compared with that of the serfs. The position of women within the family was examined. The idle, useless life of middle- and upper-class women was condemned, and women were called to productive work and economic independence. As

a result of these discussions, a feminist view of women developed, *i. e.*, a view of women as oppressed, restricted, and discriminated against as a group. This recognition of the existing oppression of women and of their rights as individuals formed the basis for a movement to change their position.

The most outspoken proponents of the woman question were the nihilists, who attacked all those forces in Russian society such as tradition, law, and authority, which combined to keep women subordinate. The nihilists argued the complete equality of the sexes and favored the free exercise of individual will and development of individual abilities. Although the nihilist solution to the women question did not lend itself to an organized women's movement because of its individualistic approach and although it gained little support in Russia outside progressive circles because of its association in the public mind with revolution and immorality, its development was a key step in the liberation of Russian women. For nihilism made such an imprint on wider progressive circles that from the early sixties the idea of the equality of men and women was firmly established, at least in theory. Nihilism created a psychological atmosphere more favorable to women's activism in the progressive part of Russian society than was generally enjoyed by Western women.

At the end of the 1850's when discussion of the woman question began, Russian society in general was engaged in a search for personal and group emancipation. Under such favorable conditions, women—only a small number of course,—responded quickly to the exhortations to study, to work, to seek personal fulfillment. The first women's association was organized in Simbirsk in 1859, and in the same year the first women appeared in the lecture halls of St. Petersburg University.³ Within two years, hundreds of women were attending lectures, not only at the University and the Medical-Surgical Academy in St. Petersburg but also at the Universities in Kiev and Kharkov. Women sought work even outside the traditional fields of teaching and governessing, rejecting the traditional view of limited roles for women. Simpler styles of dress and "non-feminine" behavior were adopted by "emancipated women". Moderate feminists emphasized philanthropic and self-help organizations such as the Society for Cheap Lodgings to aid poor women and a women's translating

and publishing artel. More radical women insisted on a total, immediate, and more personal emancipation—running away from home or entering fictitious marriages when necessary to gain personal freedom, joining communes, asserting a right to sexual freedom, etc.

Despite the wide range of women's responses, they tended to be largely individual with little organizational form. Early efforts to organize women's clubs founded on government restrictions limiting organizations to educational and philanthropic activities, a ban which continued into the twentieth century. Other attempts at organization collapsed from inexperience and lack of agreement among women as well as from a lack of feminist consciousness.

By the mid-sixties women found it necessary to reassess the direction of their demands under the stress of a number of changing conditions. By the late 1860's and early 1870's the main focus of Russian feminists was on access to higher education and professional and white collar employment. These goals were to remain the focus of the movement until the turn of the century when changing political conditions and a change in women themselves made possible a broader feminist movement.

Why this decades long focus on education and employment? The answer lies in both the political and social conditions in Russia and the needs of women themselves.

As reaction against reform gained strength in the mid-sixties, the opposition to the emancipation of women became vocal and it became obvious that the nihilist idea of immediate, total emancipation for women could not be realized for women generally. The sexual aspects of liberation combined with the participation of women in student uprisings, the Polish revolt, and the Karakazov affair led to the denunciation of the women's movement as one of those liberal reforms which was threatening to undermine the stability of society. Not until the early twentieth century would the climate again be as favorable to the liberation of women as it had been in the reform era.

Furthermore, radical thought, which in the 1860's had proclaimed the emancipation of women as one of the most important tasks of society, began to call women to revolution in the name of broader social goals. Women, who as a group had not yet

achieved their emancipation, were called upon to give up their special struggle and devote themselves to the total solution of the social question. Thus, the women's movement lost its most outspoken base of public support and, at the same time, a considerable number of women who moved away from feminism to political radicalism.⁴

The withdrawal of the radicals meant that the moderate feminist position went almost unchallenged within the women's movement until the early twentieth century. From the beginning, moderate feminists had avoided the more controversial issues, preferring to work within the legal framework of governmental approval thru accommodation and gradual reform. Within this context, education was an ideal issue for it was more likely than women's issues to gain public and governmental support. Russia needed educated workers and faith in education as the key to rapid progress for Russia was widespread. Women sought to capitalize on this by stressing the service aspect of their striving for education and employment rather than the emancipatory.

But the feminists not only argued that Russia need educated women, they also insisted that women needed education. The economic changes resulting from the emancipation of the serfs denied many women of the privileged classes the economic security they had previously enjoyed, and large numbers of them now had to find a way to earn a living. But they couldn't work in factories— they wanted the same kinds of jobs as the men of their class had. For professional and white collar employment, education was essential.

Beyond the economic benefits, education was important to women themselves. Education offered a means to self-fulfilment, self-development, and emancipation—and a chance to share in the exciting intellectual and political currents of the day, a chance to prepare themselves for service in the great task of uplifting the Russian masses.

Other factors also limited the focus of feminist activities. A number of the issues raised by feminists in the West were not appropriate to Russia at the time. Woman suffrage was not an issue in the absence of male suffrage. Russian women already had full property rights and were legally entitled to inherit a specified share of both moveable and landed property. Russian

law sharply limited divorce, but the legal conditions were the same for both sexes. Authority over the children was shared by both parents. The socio-economic conditions in Russia precluded a working class or peasant oriented feminist movement. Most Russian feminists were from the poorer gentry, the middle bureaucracy and the small professional intelligentsia, and the concerns of the women of these classes dominated the movement. Radical women came from these same classes and it is worth noting that a common interest in education served as a point of contact between moderate and radical women throughout the period.

The educational issue had been among the first to be raised in relation to the woman question. Discussions ranged from reform of secondary education thru the suitability of women for higher education to the value of coeducation at all levels. A brief outline of the history of higher education for women is provided below since the topic has been generally ignored in all studies of the Russian educational system.⁵

Reform of secondary education for women began in 1858 with the creation of girls' gymnasiums, *i.e.*, day schools open to all classes. The number of these schools grew rapidly despite a lack of state support, and by the twentieth century the number of girls exceeded the number of boys studying in the gymnasiums of the Education Ministry. However, girls' gymnasiums devoted less time than the boys' gymnasiums to the study of mathematics, natural sciences, and classical languages, thus leaving their graduates less well-prepared for further study and making it possible for officials to continue to argue that women were not adequately prepared for higher education. Not until 1916, was the curriculum of the girls' gymnasiums made equivalent to that in the boys' gymnasiums.

Although women attended university lectures briefly in the early 60's, the new university statutes of 1863 excluded them completely. Forced out of the universities, women were left with two alternatives: to go abroad to study or to create their own higher educational institutions. Study abroad offered greater freedom, more immediate opportunity, and until 1911, the only opportunity for a Russian woman to earn an academic degree. The graduation of Russia's first woman doctor, Nadezha Suslova, from Zurich University in 1867 provided an example for women

seeking higher education. By the summer of 1873, at least 100 Russian women were registered at the University and the Teknikum.⁶ In subsequent years, Russian women entered other European universities as well. The number of Russian women studying abroad fluctuated, depending on internal Russian conditions, but remained only a small percentage of women seeking higher education.

Inside Russia, women worked on the second alternative. In Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kiev, and Kharkov in the late 1860's and early 1870's, groups of women demanded access to higher education and organized informal classes with the support of university professors. A few women petitioned for admission to various higher educational institutions and a few began, again, to attend lectures in the men's institutions—but unofficially for government policy has not changed. An appeal for a women's university was rejected by the government, as were petitions for the creation of women's divisions within the men's universities. Minister of Education Dimitri A. Tolstoi asserted the women were not prepared for higher education, had no need for it, and were morally and intellectually inferior.⁷ All that women were permitted were preparatory courses to correct the deficiencies in their secondary education—the Alarchinskie in St. Petersburg and the Lubianskie in Moscow, both opening in 1869—and public lecture courses, organized first in St. Petersburg, the Vladimirskie Courses, and subsequently in several other university cities. Organizing efforts, then and later, were limited to university cities by dependence on professors as instructors, but the courses drew support and students from all parts of Russia.

In the early 1870's, government policy changed, partly due to the need for professionals and partly from a desire to keep women from going abroad to study, where they came in contact with socialist and anarchist movements.⁸ In 1872 the government responded to demands by women for medical training and to the need for better-trained midwives with permission for courses for Learned Midwives under the auspices of the Medical-Surgical Academy. Although supposedly designed only to train midwives, the professors, who supported women's efforts to become doctors, provided the same courses and level of instruction as was given to men students; and in 1876, in recognition of this, the courses

were organized and renamed the Women's Medical Courses. Twentyfive women doctors from the first graduating class received acclaim for their service in evacuation and field hospitals during the Russo-Turkish War.⁹

Also in 1872 and again in response to women's petitions and state needs—in this case for better-trained teachers—two-year experimental higher courses for women were authorized in Moscow under the direction of Moscow University Professor V. I. Guerrier. Finally, in 1876 the government gave approval for the creation of higher courses in all university cities. Courses were established in Kazan in 1876 and in Kiev and St. Petersburg in 1878. The Lubianskie Preparatory Courses in Moscow were reorganized to become the equivalent of higher courses in mathematics and science but were denied official recognition as higher courses.¹⁰ However, permission was not granted for courses in Odessa, Kharkov, and Warsaw, for in 1879 government policy again changed. Due to an increase in student political activities and the beginnings of terrorism, a Special Council headed by Minister of State Domains P. A. Valuev concluded that the opening of additional higher courses for women would be "generally undesirable".¹¹ In Warsaw, women refused to accept this decision and opened secret, illegal courses which operated for some time before being raided by the police and the organizers arrested. Although the organizers were acquitted in court, the courses were not permitted to reopen.¹²

The hostility to women's courses increased following the assassination of Alexander II in 1881. Minister of Education I. D. Delianov spear-headed an effort to eliminate the courses by closing admission to them on the pretext of studying their reorganization.¹³ By this means the government forced the closing of all the women's courses except the Higher Courses for Women in St. Petersburg, to which admissions were reopened in 1889 following a direct appeal to the tsar by women and their supporters. In Moscow following the closing of the Guerrier and Lubianskie Courses, the Society of Governesses and Women Teachers organized informal four-year Collective Lessons for women, essentially higher courses but without the official trappings and without official requirements and restrictions.¹⁴

After the death of Alexander III in 1894, women were more

successful in their demands for higher education. A Women's Medical Institute opened in St. Petersburg in 1897, Higher Courses for Women in Moscow in 1900 (however, the Collective Lesson were closed at the same time), and Women's Pedagogical Institutes in St. Petersburg and Odessa in 1903. During this same time a few private courses for women were also permitted to open. However, repeated petitions for women's courses from other cities were ignored, rejected out of hand, or subjected to bureaucratic delay. Petitions for admission to the universities were also rejected. Only with the coming of revolution in 1905 did this situation change. Briefly after 1905, women were admitted to the universities and some of the technical institutes, but admission was again closed to them by the Minister of Education in 1908. However, the demand of women for higher education could not be stifled. Within the next decade the universities were again opened to women on a limited basis and more than thirty additional higher educational institutions for women were authorized. The program of women's courses expanded to add faculties in law, medicine, natural science, and economics and commerce to the traditional historico-philological and physico-mathematical faculties. The first women's agricultural and technological institutes were organized in St. Petersburg in 1904 and 1906 respectively.

While the government permitted these courses to exist, it did little to encourage them. In 1911/12 the Ministry of Education spent 7·5 million rubles on higher education, but only 230,000 rubles (3·08 per cent) was spent on women's education and all but 11,600 rubles of that small amount was spent on the Women's Medical Institute.¹⁵ It was left to women themselves to raise the money to finance women's education.

Nor did the government recognize the worth of the education provided by the women's courses. Completion of the university course and passing of the state examination admitted men students to the tenth rank in the Russian civil service. Women graduates of the higher courses were not admitted to the state examination and were given only the right to teach at the elementary and intermediate levels, a right granted to gymnasium graduates. Not until the turn of the century were the right to teach beyond the intermediate level extended to women and the rights of women doctors established on an equal footing with men. The right to

practise law, except in Siberia, was denied to women by an Imperial ukaz issued in 1876 and continued to be denied until 1917. However, in 1911 the government did recognize certain higher courses for women as equivalent to universities, making their graduates eligible for academic degrees and admission to the state examination but not for access to the civil service and *chin*.¹⁶

What we have here, nevertheless, is a success story. For women, despite the opposition of the state and much of society, succeeded in establishing a number of institutions that were universities in all but name. From a few hundred students in the first courses in 1872/73, the number expanded to an early high of almost 2,500 students in 1881/82, to 6,000 in 1904/06, and to a minimum of 28,500 in 1911/12, which represented approximately 30% of the students in all higher educational institutions.¹⁷ By the early twentieth century, women students thru their diligence and academic achievement had gained a grudging acceptance by both state and society of women's right to and capability for higher education. Although all the professions except teaching continued to be male-dominated, women had overcome great hostility and resistance to establish themselves as doctors (2,000 in 1908), chemists, statisticians, archaeologists, astronomers—a whole range of professions. In so doing they proved that expanding roles for women could be beneficial to society.

But Russian women had gained something else in the struggle as well. They had gained self-confidence, organizational skills, and experience in dealing with the power structure and in handling their own affairs. One of the unique characteristics of the higher courses for women was the role of public initiative in their founding and the participation of women, including women students, in their operation in a society where educational initiative traditionally was taken by the state and educational institutions were run by the state bureaucracy. Virtually every one of the women's institutions resulted from women's own initiative. Women petitioned academic and scientific bodies, state ministers, and the tsar himself in their search for educational and employment opportunities. They conducted a variety of fund-raising activities to keep the courses afloat. In St. Petersburg they even succeeded in building their own facilities complete with an astro-

nomic observatory. Organizations were created to raise funds for needy students and to find jobs for graduates, The Alarchinskie Courses, the Lubianskie Courses, and the Collective Lessons were run by the students themselves. The Vladimirskie, St. Petersburg, and Kiev Courses and many of those courses established after 1905 were run by women's organizations—the most important by virtue of size and achievements being the Society to Finance the Higher Courses for Women in St. Petersburg. The nucleus of that society was the group of women who had raised the question of higher education for women in St. Petersburg in 1868, who then proceeded to organize and finance the Vladimirskie Courses, and finally to organize, finance and operate the St. Petersburg Higher Courses, and to fight for their existence when they were threatened with extinction in 1880's. Members of this organization were in the forefront of efforts in the 1890's and early 1900's to cooperate with the international feminist movement, to establish a variety of women's organizations, and to improve the position of women.

Government restrictions on organizational activity prevented the development of feminist organizations *per se*, which in other countries provided moral support and helped to develop a sense of community among women. The women who participated in the struggle for higher education, both as students and as organizers, formed the nucleus of the women's movement in nineteenth-century Russia. The organizing activities of the supporters and the corporate activities of women students provided the only institutionalized expression of the movement. These organizations provided a modicum of communication among women, kept the movement growing, and kept women's issues before the public during a period of reaction.

The four decades from the era of reform to the outbreak of revolution during which feminists focussed their attention on education should be viewed as both a holding action against regressive pressures and a period of preparation for broader activity. While education had not changed the position of women in society as much as had been anticipated by its early proponents—discrimination in employment, low pay, and traditional roles for women continued to be the norm—it did change the perceptions of a number of women. The struggle itself did much to raise the consciousness

of those women involved for the denial of educational opportunity was a clear example of discrimination against women as a group, of a view of women as intellectually inferior and limited to family activities. But education increased women's self-confidence and increased their demands. Educated women were not satisfied with traditional, limited roles. The broadening of the women's movement at the turn of the century reflected not only the changed political climate but the growing reservoir of well-educated professional women who sought a broader scope for their activities and those of women in general. It is not coincidental that professional women led the struggle for broader women's rights in the twentieth century.

FOOTNOTES

1. Zhukovskaja, *Zapiski* (Leningrad, 1930), p. 35.
2. Mikhailov's writings on the woman question are collected in *Zhenshchiny, ikh vospitanie i znachenie ... (Iz Sovremennika 1858–1866 gg.)* (SPB, 1903). For treatment of the significance of Mikhailov see Richard Stites, "M. L. Mikhailov and the Emergence of the Woman Question in Russia," *Canadian Slavic Studies*, III (Summer 1969), 178–199.
3. L. F. Panteleev, *Iz vospominanii proshlogo* (SPB, 1905), pp. 133–136; Mikhailov, *Zhenshchiny*, p. 81; *Razsvet*, 1861, no. 8, pp. 501–505; S. Ashevskii, "Russkoe studenchesvo v epokhu shestidesiatykh godov," *Sovremennyi mir*, July–August 1907, Pt. 1, p. 21; *Russkaia shkola*, December 1901, Pt. 2, p. 109.
4. For a stimulating analysis of this phenomenon see Barbara Alpern Engel, "From Feminism to Populism: A Study of Changing Attitudes of Women of the Russian Intelligentsia: 1855–1881," (Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1974).
5. The best Russian account is Elena O. Likhacheva, *Materialy dlia istorii zhenskago obrazovaniia v Rossii*, 2 vols. (SPB, 1899, 1901). See also K. Shokhol, "K voprosu o razvitiu vysshago zhenskago obrazovaniia v Rossii," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniya*, XL (August 1911), Pt. 4, 153–195; XLIV (March 1913), Pt. 4, 1–36; XLVI (July 1913), Pt. 4, 1–58; S. Peterburgskie Vysshie Zhenskie Kursy za 25 let. (1878–1902) (SPB, 1903); Sophia A. Satina, *Obrazovanie zhenshchin v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii* (New York, 1966); Ruth A. Dudgeon, "Women and Higher Education in Russia, 1855–1905," (Ph. D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1975).
6. Jan Meijer, *Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zuerich (1870–1873)* (Assen, The Netherlands, 1955), pp. 25, 208–215. P. N. Arijan, *Pervyi zhenskii kalendar, na 1899 god*, pp. 140–141, gives enrollment figures for Swiss and French universities for several decades.

7. "Po povodu zhezskago adresa, podannago g. Ministru Narodnago Prosveshcheniiia v Kharkove," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniiia*, October 1870, pp. 269-274.
8. The situation in Zurich created such concern that the government published an ukaz attacking the motives of women studying there and threatening to exclude them from all educational and professional activities in Russia if they continued to study in Zurich. *Pravitstvenny i vestnik*, 1873, no. 120 (21 May).
9. Selections from the report of the Chief Army Medical Inspector are quoted in P. N. Tarnovskaia, "Zhenskii meditsinskii institut i zhenskie vrachebnye kursy. Istoricheskii ocherk," *Vestnik Evropy*. August 1903, p. 506.
10. The Lubianskie Courses, however were treated as higher courses in the 1880's when the government decided to close admission to all the higher courses.
11. From the personal papers of Valuev quoted in P. A. Zaionchkovskii, *Krizis samoderzhaviia na rubezhe 1870-1880-kh godov* (M, 1964), p. 119.
12. Based on an account by one of the founders, Ia. Shchabinskaia-David, "Zhenskoe dvizhenie v Polshe za posledniia 25 let," in *Trudy I-ago vserossiiskago zhenskago sezda pri russkom zhenskom obshchestve v S. Peterburge, 10-18 Dek. 1908* (SPB, 1909), pp. 852-855.
13. This is the conclusion of Professor P. A. Zaionchkovskii of Moscow University based on a study of archival materials. *Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie v kontse xix stoletiia* (M, 1970), p. 311.
14. There were certain advantages to women in these less formal courses. Any one could enroll—an advantage for number of women who had studied at home and did not meet formal entrance requirements. Tuition was lower and enrollment much higher. Furthermore, no certificate of political loyalty was required. A demand for such certification was one reason a number of Russian women continued to study abroad even after Women's Courses were established in Russia.
15. Ivan S. Kliuzhev, "Voprosy sredniago zhenskago obrazovaniia v obsuzhdenii ikh v Gosudarstvennoi Dume," *Trudy I-ago Vserossiiskago Sezda po Obrazovaniiu Zhenshchin, organizov. Rossiisk. Ligoi Ravnopr. Zhenshchin v S. Peterburge* (Petrograd, 1915), II, 136.
16. "Ob ispetaniakh lits zhenskago pola v svanii kursa vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenii i o poriadke priobreteniia imi uchenykh stepenei i svaniiia uchitelnitsy srednikh uchebnykh zavedenii," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniiia*, XLI (October 1912), Pt. 1, 129-137.
17. Neither Russian nor Soviet sources provide sufficient statistics on enrollment in higher educational institutions for women. Information has been collected from a number of sources of varying reliability; consequently, these figures should be taken as approximations rather than absolutes. The total for 1911/12 was based on 27 institutions and does not include women enrolled in coeducational institutions, in two higher courses for which no statistics are available, and 2- and 3-year specialty courses.

7

Poles In America : A Bicentennial View

FRANK MOCHA

The Bicentennial was, for various ethnic groups in America, including the Polish, a time of stock-taking, of re-assessing their contributions to their adopted country. This is not an easy task. "Poles in America" or, more precisely, "Polish Contributions to America", is a difficult problem mainly because it is difficult to find the right approach to it. Speakers usually have dealt with it by first citing the number of Americans of Polish origin in this country, and then listing the most famous Poles in America, from Pulaski to Muskie, and saying a few words about each of them. This is no longer the best way to approach the subject, because it barely scratches the surface of the Polish presence and experience.

This paper is based on the conclusions reached in a two-term course, "Poles in America : A Bicentennial View," taught and co-ordinated by this writer at the School of Continuing Education, New York University, during the academic year 1975/76, where it formed the concluding lecture. In a slightly revised version the paper was presented in the "Bicentennial panel at the Eighth National Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) in St. Louis in October of 1976. An expanded and updated version of the paper forms the concluding essay (XXII) of my book, *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*, which is now in production.

The paper, in both its early versions, was primarily addressed to Polish American audiences, and so is the book. The author did not feel it desirable to alter his point of view for the purposes of the present article, in the belief that such alterations would cause the article to lose some of its poignancy.

in America: by concentrating on the obvious, it neglects other, no less, and perhaps even more important contributions. These can now, at this point in our history, be pieced together from a growing number of books and articles devoted to the Polish experience in America.

The latest bibliography, published by the Director of the Polish Museum of America in Chicago, lists close to 1700 items.¹ They include accounts of Polish contributions to America spread over 368 years, from the first Polish settlement in Jamestown, Virginia, through Polish contributions to American history in war and peace, to the present. Forthcoming publications, both individual² and joint (or institutional), will enrich the existing materials considerably. Among the latter are works-in-progress by the Kosciuszko Foundation,³ the Polish Institute of Arts and Science,⁴ the Polish American Historical Association,⁵ and the already mentioned *Bicentennial Essays*.⁶ While the first three projects represent works with scholarly-popular, sociological, or historical interest, the last includes all three, *plus* chapters-articles on religion, education, organizational structure, and a special section on Polish contributions in various fields of scholarship and culture, in an attempt to sum up Polish achievements in America.

The achievements are considerable, but not as overwhelming as the enthusiasm stimulated by the Bicentennial would lead us to believe. A little overdosing on the Bicentennial is only to be expected, but we must keep our heads and maintain a sense of proportion. It is true that the Poles have had outstanding representatives— even authentic heroes or real geniuses—in almost every walk of life in America. In recent years, a Polish American was a serious candidate for the Presidency. More recently, two other representatives of Polonia had, and are still having, direct bearing on the highest office in the land: one, an outstanding jurist, by serving as a special prosecutor in a celebrated case involving a President then in office; the other, a brilliant political scientist, by advising a Presidential candidate on foreign policy.⁷ (Characteristically, one of the men is American-born, the other, Polish-born; the relevancy of this distinction will become clear later in the paper.) It would seem that the Poles are reaching for the highest offices in the land, offices with real access to power, something which the Polish Americans never had in their entire

history in this country. Nothing could be more wrong than such an assumption, since it would indicate that the process of "Making It" was completed for Polish Americans. It definitely is *not*.

The truth is that the above are highly isolated cases, and hardly harbingers of a massive exalted upward mobility on the part of Polonia. The special prosecutor's case, particularly, is more symbolic than real, as pointed out during the Watergate affair by Leopold Tyrmand, in his excellent article in the *New York Times* on Jaworski and Sirica. The rather symbolic nature of Polish contributions was stressed in a different context by a noted Polish American sociologist with reference to Polish representation in other branches of learning and prominence.⁸ We have only to look at the slim number of Polish Americans in the Senate and in the Congress, and notice their chronic absence on the Supreme Court and in the Cabinet, to realize this truth. Holders of these highest offices are traditionally (s)elected or recruited from the legal profession, and here we encounter another shock: the infinitesimal ratio of Polish names on the published list of successful candidates in examinations for admittance to the Bar. Going further down in search of talent and future potential, we can check the lists of successful scholarship and fellowship winners. Here the situation is better, and the ratio of Polish names approximates their ratio in population figures. A recent National Merit Scholarship list for New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, includes five unmistakably Polish names among 134 entries.⁹ If we assume that there are many Polish Americans whose names have been changed or modified, and thus not readily identifiable as Polish, we can say that Polish Americans are well represented on the lower rungs of the ladder of success. The trouble is, their upward climb on the ladder has traditionally been slow.

The uncertainty about names introduces a whole series of new problems into the already difficult task of evaluating the Polish contributions to America. Who is of Polish origin and who isn't, who wants to be considered so and who doesn't? What are the criteria on mixed marriages, and what do we do with the Ukrainians, Jews, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, and others, born and raised in Poland, especially when these representatives of the former Polish minorities are claimed by their own ethnic groups

in America? Suppose these claims begin to work retroactively, as they already do in some cases? I was startled last spring at a conference in New York on Language and Culture¹⁰ to hear a young scholar of Polish-Ukrainian origin claim the first settlers in Jamestown, Virginia, as Ukrainian. Last summer, in an article in the *New York Times* about the Museum of American Jewish History in Philadelphia, I found a reference to "Haym Salomon, Broker,"¹¹ without a single word of explanation that he was Polish, and that he represents a vital part of the Polish American heritage. These are problems that can seriously erode the Polish claims in America. If we add to this the way the Poles have been taken for granted here, the way, in fact, Poland, and not just the Polish vote, has been used by successive Administrations, as pointed out brilliantly by a young historian recently,¹² with all the unfortunate images that this helps to create, we can say that, for some reason, the Polish Americans, as a group, have not been able so far to forge a stronger, more positive image of itself.

However, a new element has entered the picture. The ethnic awakening in America, followed closely by the Bicentennial, have done a great deal to stimulate interest in one's ancestry. In a non-heroic age, when the traditional ways to fame and recognition have lost most of the lustre, to acknowledge one's membership in an ethnic group is a way to be recognized. The "Kiss me, I am Polish" buttons are one way of expressing the urge, as described by a young Yale female scholar of Lithuanian origin.¹³ America is suddenly discovering the Poles, and the Poles are discovering themselves. "Closet Poles", so called by the Presidential Adviser on Ethnic Affairs, are coming out of hiding, particularly after every Presidential nomination of a Polish American to a high office, and Poles take justifiable pride at every Polish achievement, be it even by visitors, such as Irena Szewinska, Jacek Wszola, and Wojtek Fibak. All the achievements are being faithfully recorded by Polish American historians, from the present all the way back to the beginning of the Polish presence in America which, too, is being re-examined. The Polish American Congress is reportedly commissioning a comprehensive Polish American history; at the same time, it is taking steps to protect the Polish image in America, by legal means, if necessary.¹⁴ All these and similar efforts may well result in a new era for the

Polish Americans, in an America whose national purpose is being reconsidered.¹⁵ The third century will be a different century for America, as brilliant editorials are proclaiming and warning;¹⁶ it will be a different century for Polish Americans, too. It may even be a Polish American century, if the Poles succeed in adapting to changes and to the altered demands and realities of the future. But until there is clear evidence of this happening, we should, instead of fluctuating between enthusiasm and holy indignation, take a look at the previous two centuries and see whether, besides the well known heroes and leaders, they contain other evidence of Polish contributions to America.

I will try to approach the subject from a different angle of attack, by first soberly examining the value of certain claims. The most common—and at the same time the least verified—claim among Polish Americans is one concerning their supposed numerical strength in this country. There are many estimates, but none of them seems to have any basis to be conclusive. There is, however, one indication on which I base my calculations. During the Kennedy Presidential campaign in 1960, the Kennedys, in an effort to determine the strength of the Polish vote, in order to decide whether to go after it—especially after acquiring a brand-new Polish brother-in-law, Prince Radziwill—have gone to the expensive trouble of counting the potential vote. Because it was vital to them, we can trust their figures. They were published in the *New York Times*, and showed that the number of Poles in America was then between 9–13 million. This was 16 years ago. Today, after allowing for a normal increase, the figures should have risen 30%, or about 1/3, to be between 12–17 million, or somewhere around 14–15 million. It is undoubtedly a large figure, larger than most official figures, including both the U. S. census figures and estimates in Poland, but it is most probably correct. Even so, the 14–15 million figure amounts to only slightly more than 6% of the total population of the United States. This is not a large percentage, but it roughly corresponds to the percentage of the U. S. population in the world, it is even slightly larger, and this should make us THINK. We could not even begin, on the basis of comparable population percentages, to compare proportionately Polish contributions to America with American contributions to the world. The fact remains that we are living in the most advanced society in the world, and in a society thus advanced it is hard to

make a noticeable contribution. And yet, America was built by national groups like ours, some larger, some smaller. It would be easy and comforting to assume that while the Polish group contributed less than most of the larger groups, such as the German, which claims that one out of every six Americans is of German ancestry,¹⁷ it contributed more than the smaller ones. Nothing could be further from the truth. Let us take the French, for example, considerably smaller group than the Polish. Putting any other kind of contribution aside, even those of Kosciuszko and Pulaski cannot equal the French contribution symbolized by Lafayette and Rochambeau, for the simple reason that the latter were backed by the power of France, while the former were individuals acting on their own initiative. This example alone, and there are others, shows the fallacy of the numbers game ; it also shows the fallacy of relying on heroes and outstanding individuals exclusively when attempting to show a national group's contribution to its adopted country. Besides, most of the heroes found themselves on these shores accidentally— as new findings in Poland tell us even about Kosciuszko— and their eyes were always turned towards their homeland, and not toward their adopted country, in which they were only as guests.¹⁸

A more valid approach is to try and evaluate the contributions of the masses which came to stay and work. To do this, we must concentrate on the 50-year period between 1864–1914, a half century during which Poles were coming to America in meaningful numbers. A great majority of Polish Americans alive today are descendants of this group. Thanks to the dedicated work of the growing number of Polish American historians, we know today a great deal about this group,¹⁹ but we probably over-react to their initial difficulties and their supposedly low position on the economic and social ladder. It is true that they were, for the most part, farm-workers, coal-miners, and, in time of national need, soldiers, but these functions, and the reasons for them, are not always properly understood and analyzed. The last function, particularly, is rarely stressed sufficiently. In World War I, 10% of the U. S. armed forces was of Polish background, not counting the 23,000 Polish Americans in Haller's army and 17,000 in other Polish units. By World War II, according to some statistics, cited and documented in Melchior Wankowicz's book, *The Poles and America*,²⁰ 17% of the U. S. armed forces was of Polish background,

This amounts to 1,700,000, an army larger than the one fielded by Poland in 1939. The percentage of Poles at that time in America is estimated to have been 4%, a figure which probably needs to be revised upwards. Even so, these figures surely tell us something about the health, energy, and, above all, patriotism of a group capable of sending every fourth member to defend its adopted country (for the entire United States the ratio was 1 in 12).

As for the other two functions, the Poles were most heavily represented in them during the Post-Civil War period of reconstruction and growth and afterwards, when America was suddenly and surprisingly catching up with England as the leading economic and industrial power of the world. Rather than over-react to the Poles' social position, we should look at them as helping to feed the rapidly growing population, and stocking the furnaces of the steel-mills which were making America solid and powerful. A good study showing the part played by Poles in the crucial and dynamic drive by America to world's primacy at the end of the XIX century and beginning of the XX century would be worth more than another book about Kosciuszko or a film about him. Such a study would show the present generation that their ancestors and predecessors were not just lowly laborers at the bottom of the economic ladder, but food producing FARMERS, BUILDERS of industry, and DEFENDERS of America.

The two World Wars provided the Poles in America with a measure of upward mobility. The G. I. Bill of Rights after World War II particularly was greatly responsible for providing young ex-servicemen with opportunities for advancement through education. The number of Poles in colleges steadily grew, stimulated by the presence in America of a considerable number of refugee-scholars from Poland, who now occupied university positions and took it upon themselves to encourage and help young Polish American students to obtain college and university degree. The results of this activity, led mostly by members of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences,²¹ and supported by Polish American Institutions, such as the Kosciuszko Foundation,²² are visible now, when the disciples themselves are occupying academic and other prestigious—even if not numerous—positions. This particular chapter in the history of the Poles in America—concerning the

role of the war-time and post-war emigration—deserves careful mention, because it, too, has been neglected and yet it represents a vital element in the positive evolution of the Polish Americans, and, as such, a further evidence of Polish contribution to America.

The latest exodus from Poland, which began in 1939 and still goes on without any signs of slackening, is an historical phenomenon on a world scale. History knows few examples of such flights of intelligentsia. It can be compared to the flight of the Greeks from endangered Byzantium, the flight which, as we know, helped bring about the Renaissance in the West; it can also be compared to the flight of the French aristocracy before the French Revolution, a flight which raised intellectual standards all over Europe, notably in Russia. More to the point, this flight can also be compared to the Russian exodus during and after the Russian Revolution; it is no accident that the Russians earn higher salaries than most other ethnic groups in America. Surely there are some obvious lessons to be learned from these examples. The Polish exodus was at first dictated by the instinct of self-preservation, but lately it has acquired the unmistakable signs of a development adding up to the fact that Poland is now able to export talent, no matter under what form this "export" is being accomplished. At any rate, the number of Poles who have left Poland since 1939 for the U. S. A. is now in the hundreds of thousands. These huge talented numbers are increasingly affecting the profile of the Polish American group, and of America itself. The impact of this influx is still underestimated, and an objective study of its significance would go a long way towards overcoming the occasional hostilities between the American-born and Polish-born segments of Polonia. When mutual acceptance becomes a rule, and we all work hand-in-hand, our progress will be speeded up immeasurably, because our inner resources are sufficient. And it is these resources, such as honesty and hard work, for which the Poles are known, and for which they were often ridiculed in the past, that are now needed more than ever in America. Let us *all* put them to work again, and carry our individual duties out well. This is the only valid way to success, it is also the best definition of patriotism. We owe it to ourselves and to America.

FOOTNOTES

1. Joseph W. Zurawski, *Polish American History and Culture : A Classified Bibliography*, Polish Museum of America, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.
2. Book-length works-in-progress which have come to the attention of this writer include the following : Thaddeus L. Kowalski's and Joseph Wieczerzak's studies on the "Polish Experience in America," to be published by Nelson-Hall Publishers of Chicago and Twayne Publishers of Boston, respectively ; and Joseph Wytrwal's ambitious, *Behold the Polish Americans!*, which is being published by Endurance Press, Detroit.
3. Wieslaw Kuniczak, editor, in co-operation with Eugene Kusielewicz, President of the Kosciuszko Foundation, *Poles in America : A Pictorial History*, to be published by Doubleday, New York. In addition, the Kosciuszko Foundation is in the process of producing 16 half-hour motion pictures on the Polish experience in America.
4. A part of this publication program of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America is a collection of chiefly sociological articles, edited by Eugene Kleban and Thaddeus V. Gromada, *The Polish Americans*, included, as a separate section, in *The Polish Review*, Vol. XXI, No. 3 (pp. 1-148), which is the "Bicentennial Issue" of the quarterly.
5. Rev. M. J. Madaj, "PAHA : The Historical Interpreter of the Polish American Community," Essay XXI in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays* (Frank Mocha, editor). This essay-report, written by the Executive Secretary of the Polish American Historical Association, lists several projects and works-in-progress, including a Festschrift for the late Prof. Oskar Halecki, and a collection of essay, *Case Studies in Polish American Politics*.
6. Frank Mocha, *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*, a collection of 22 specialized articles covering a wide range of Polish experience and presence in America.
7. Zbigniew Brzezinski has since become Presidential Adviser on Foreign Policy and Chairman of National Security Council in President Carter's Cabinet.
8. Konstantin Symmons-Symonolewicz, "Polish Contributions to American Scholarship in the Fields of Sociology and Cultural Anthropology (1918-1976)," Essay XII in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*.
9. "National Merit Awards Go To 1,000 More Students," *The New York Times*, May 3, 1976.
10. Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Language and Culture : Heritage and Aorizons. Annual Convention held in New York, March 26, 1976.
11. Israel Shenker, "Jewish Museum Opening Has A Colonial Theme," *The New York Times*, July 19, 1976.

12. Piotr Wandycz, "Stany Zjednoczone a Polska" (The United States and Poland), *Trybuna*, London, Nr. 23/79, 1976, pp. 6-11.
Authorized translation (by F. Mocha), "The United States and Poland: An attempt at Historical Synthesis," included as Essay VI in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*.
13. Elona Marijosius Vaisnys, "A Lithuanian and the Country Gentleman," *The New York Times*.
14. Aloysius Mazewski, President, Polish American Congress and Polish National Alliance, in a paper read in a panel, "Polish Americans at the Bicentennial; Nine Facets of Institutional Relations," at the Midwest Slavic Conference, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, May 6-8, 1976.
15. *The National Purpose Reconsidered : 1776-1976*, a series of lectures at Columbia University in 1976 in honor of the National Bicentennial.
16. For example, the July 4, 1976, editorial, "Third Century," in *The New York Times*.
17. Craig R. Whitney, "Rockefeller Accepts Tribute in Germany On U. S. Bicentennial," *The New York Times*, May 6, 1976. ("Vice President Rockefeller, himself of German ancestry, ...")
18. A good insight into the attitudes and motivations of the Polish heroes in America can be found in Metchie J. E. Budka, "Pulaski and Kosciuszko: Heroes Extremely Apropos," Essay II in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*; and, to a certain extent, also in Maria J. E. Copson-Niecko, "The Poles in America from 1830's to 1870 : Some Reflections on Possibilities of Research," Essay III.
19. The most recent study on this subject is Edward Pinkowski's essay, "The Great Influx of Polish Immigrants and the Industries They Entered," Essay IV in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*.
20. Melchior Wankowicz, *Polacy i Ameryka* (The Poles and America), Oficyna Poctow i Malarzy na Emigracji w Anglia, p. 44.
21. Good accounts of the Polish Institute's activities in the United States can be found in two unofficial histories of the Institute: Stanislaw Strzelenski, *The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, Origin and Development* (New York, 1960); and Damian S. Wandycz, *Polski Instytut Naukowy w Ameryce, W Trzydziesta Rocznica 1942-1972* (The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, Thirtieth Anniversary 1942-1972) (New York, 1974). For an account of the Institute's activities on behalf of Polish Americans, see Frank Mocha, "Dzialalnosc Polskiego Instytutu Naukowego w Ameryce w dziedzinie badan nad zbiorowosciami Polonijnymi" (The Activities of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in the Area of Polonia Research) in *Stan i potrzeby badan nad zbiorowosciami Polonijnymi* (The Present State and Further Need of Research on Polonia), Polish Academy of Sciences (Ossolineum, 1976), pp. 438-450, translated (by Marion V. Winters) and revised and updated by the author as "The Polish

Institute of Arts and Sciences in America and Its Contributions to the Study of Polonia: The Origins of the Polish American Historical Association (PAHA)", and included as Essay XVIII in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*.

22. For a detailed account of the activities of the Kosciuszko Foundation, see Eugene Kusielewicz, "The Kosciuszko Foundation— A Half Century of Progress," Essay XX in *Poles in America : Bicentennial Essays*.

8

Ethnicity and Social Control*

MICHAEL V. BELOK

First of all, let us make clear that minority problems are not peculiar to the United States. They are pandemic. Every part of the world faces minority problems. Whether it be North America, South America, Europe, Africa or Asia, the problem of ethnic groups exists. The shift to the term ethnic groups should alert the reader to the close association of minorities and ethnicity in problem situations. Although the two terms are not synonymous, they are very closely related in many practical situations. Even the term problem is closely related. Minorities, ethnicity and problems seem very often to go together, as does conflict. If a society is homogeneous, then minorities, ethnicity and conflict of the sort associated with our discussion are non-existent. But this is seldom the case. We can start with the basic premise that both minority and ethnic groups are associated with potential conflict and that both are conceived as potentially disintegrative elements in most societies. In a society, such as that of the United States, where the very sense of identity and nationhood was a problematic one, the threat of minorities or ethnic groups perceived as alien to the society is even more exacerbated. When the United States came into being, it did

* A longer version of this paper will appear in the *Handbook for Social Control* edited by Joseph S. Roucek, Greenwood Press forthcoming.

not represent a nation in this fullest sense. A sense of national identity and national character had to be created. The population was by no means homogenous; a fact we tend to forget.¹ Thus the pervasive concern with the meaning of American so much a part of American life is understandable.

In order to exist, societies must maintain self-sufficiency and order. This requires a broad commitment to the values of the society—the common values. They are the cement of societal self-sufficiency. There does not have to be agreement on all values but, minimally, on a small core of values held by all members of the societal unit. For most societies order is of primary importance and the maintenance of the society depends upon it. Without this minimal agreement there would be chaos and a breakdown of the system. Values are an integrating factor.

Very often, as far as the dominant group is concerned, the values of minority groups are dysfunctional. They see the immigrant or, as in the case of the United States, the native population and the imported group (the blacks) as a threat. Blacks and immigrants cannot be done without but they are still a threat to the social cohesiveness of the society. Witness the frequent riots characterizing American society, whether it be early black slave riots, Catholics rioting against Protestants, Irish rioting against free blacks in New York City during the Civil War, or the more recent Black riots of the 1960's.²

In times of accelerated social change, people tend to perceive their world as threatening and dangerous. This is especially significant to the institutions of the society entrusted with the task of socialization and enculturation. The dominant values of American society have been equality and achievement according to Seymour Martin Lipset, and their "... dynamic interaction ... has been a constant element in data determining American institutions and behavior."³ These institutions attempt to maintain the status quo in order to preserve some semblance of order and stability.

As the process of industrialization and modernization developed, the values of achievement and equality were especially useful. American society moved toward a rationally organized, bureaucratic structure. Following Parsons we may speak of the structural components of norms, values, collectivities, and roles. The

aspects of the developmental process are inclusion, value generalization, differentiation, and adaptive upgrading. Probably the most important socializing agency is the school. Adults, with some exceptions, are socialized elsewhere. It is the school that prepares the individual for adult roles. It is the school class that prepares the individual to be motivated to perform adult roles and have the technical knowledge and skills necessary to adequately perform these roles. Individuals must be socialized so that they adequately perform the roles required by the society and be committed to their performance. In other words, they must internalize the behavior expected of them in these social roles as they also learn the necessary roles which society requires to function. Here it might be useful to mention some pattern alternatives available such as universalism *vs.* particularism, achievement *vs.* ascription, and specificity *vs.* diffuseness.⁴

The minority groups often do not share the commitment to the values mentioned above. Basically members of traditional societies, they more often than not were oriented toward particularism and ascription rather than universalism and achievement. But American society based upon equality and achievement required new learnings and adaptations by the minorities if they wish to become part of the society in the fullest sense. Very often they chose not to. Not having been socialized to American society and its values the immigrants were strangers. They had not been basically socialized. Following Gerald Rosenblum, the term "basic socialization" may be introduced. Basic socialization means the individual has incorporated the "generalized norms and values characterizing a society" so they can perform the social roles adequately both in the area of skills and attitudes. Intermediate socialization is specialized socialization. The individual learns the special behavior patterns expected in "differentiated subsystems," such as work settings.⁵ The individual is an "expedient member" of the society, not a "genuine member" who has been basically socialized. With the immigrants this was the pattern for most of the adults. The second generation became more "genuine members" of American society. Probably, something similar to this is going on in regard to other minorities as they are moving more and more toward something resembling "expedient members" or toward "genuine membership" in the larger society.

ALTERNATIVE RESPONSES TO MINORITIES

Although the minority "problem" has been around since the very beginnings, the response of the dominant American groups has not been uniform or consistent. In the beginning, the Indians were to be civilized and made into Christians; but, very soon the response changed and the Indians were considered by many as a "nuisance" and group to be exterminated. Others deplored this approach and continued their efforts to convert the tribes to Christianity. Some felt exclusion or isolation was the best policy (the reservation policy) and some felt that assimilation was a possibility. The various tribes had other ideas. Some fought the whites until exhausted; others tried to conform to the white man's way such as the Cherokee; and, still others tried isolation.

The immigrants' situation was different. He came of his own accord and in some cases did not intend to stay. As soon as he made his "fortune", he would return to his native land. In the meantime, he worked hard as long as work was available and fit the pattern we have identified as an "expedient member" of the society, trying all the time to stay clear of flagrantly flouting local mores and laws. But gradually his position changed and he found himself either unable to return to his homeland or now committed to staying in the new land.

At first America welcomed the immigrants. After all was not America the "asylum" of the world opening its doors to all.⁶ And work was usually plentiful, at least menial tasks that the older groups no longer cared to do. Also there was plenty of land and the immigrants were often a source of profit to the old American. From time to time, the antagonisms between the "new" groups and the "old" flared up in riots and nativist political parties, viewing the foreigners with suspicion, but, for the most part, the various groups were able to accommodate themselves to each other. Thus arose the three basic responses to the minorities (excluding the Indians and the Blacks). First the policy of assimilation or acculturation. Under this approach, the minorities would be made into Anglo-Saxons. They and their children would become Americans. If not "true" Anglo-Saxons, at least, they would learn the dominant ideas of the American culture. They would be taught the virtues of cleanliness, hard work (as if they needed this), thrift, order and respect for the American

Constitution and system of laws. Except for some extremists, most Americans were willing to accept the new minorities on these terms. All the vehicles of socialization and acculturation would be used—the schools, the press, and the factory. Not only the children but adults also went to school to learn the American language and be indoctrinated in the American beliefs and values. The factory would socialize the adult into the pattern of behaviors appropriate in the work settings. The irrational patterns of the peasant past would have to be forgotten. Mills and mines did not defer to feast days and religious holidays. If the immigrants could not read English, there was the immigrant press that could be manipulated to acculturate the immigrant and help him adapt to the American scene. If this did not work, it provided him with a release; a place to air his woes, a vehicle for catharsis. American advertisers could be used to subsidize the press and keep editors in line. The American immigrant press was also a vehicle to help the immigrant find out who he was. Many were peasants and had no real sense of identity. They were men of a particular locale and only in America did many discover a wider sense of identity. In America, their ethnic identifications were often born and they became Italians, Russians, Slovaks, etc.⁷

The second response was the "Melting Pot" put forth by many Americans. The immigrants would be fused with other Americans to form a new race. They would, in the words of Israel Zangwill, become a "super race". The "Melting Pot" idea was not new. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur had written of a new man very early on. Even Benjamin Rush had written of the "melting of the youth of all states into one mass of citizens."⁸ The melting pot became a popular image but one that many writers agree failed. Some did not want to be melted and they were not racists but simply believers in their own ethnic values and culture. They did not want to be homogenized into a uniform American type.

Those who wished to retain their ethnic identity and, as often was the case, even forge it brought forth the third idea—cultural pluralism. Basic to this position was the belief that various ethnic groups could retain much of their culture while still remaining an integral part of American society. Ethnic groups had always maintained a certain degree of identity from the earliest

times in colonial America. Actually what occurred was a form of segregated pluralism with various immigrant groups concentrated in certain geographical areas: the Germans in Pennsylvania, the Dutch in New York, the English in New England and Virginia. This pattern continued late into the nineteenth century with regional settlements the rule rather than the exception, but with the coming of the "new" immigrants in the period of 1880 to 1920 significant changes occurred and immigrants began settling in groups all over the country. The result was a new pattern that could be characterized as integrated pluralism. Various ethnic groups were in close and continual contact with one another.

Conflicts were inevitable. The dominant group in American society found this threatening. Although some did not view it with alarm, many did. All the familiar charges were brought forth. The new immigrants threatened the racial integrity of the Anglo-Saxons. They were inferior, unclean, criminally inclined, and subversive both politically and in the area of religion. Demands for immigrant restrictions were made. Literacy tests were advocated, exclusion by state laws was tried, and laws for Asiatic exclusion were successfully passed, and finally, the National Origins Quota Act of 1924 was passed.⁹

SOME MINORITY GROUPS

Many have assumed that the "White Ethnics" have been more-or-less assimilated into the dominant culture and have achieved success commensurate with their individual abilities. The evidence is mixed to say the least. The white ethnics refuse to go away. They are still labeled by others as "Polacks," "Wops," "Hunkies," etc. They also often seem to perceive themselves in terms of their ethnic identities. The Melting Pot has been declared a failure countless times but some still adhere to this notion. Assimilation or "Anglo-conformity" still has its adherents. But, increasingly, there has been a growing recognition of the persistence of ethnic identification well into the third and fourth generations.¹⁰

Whatever the reasons for the recent revival of white ethnicity, nostalgia, search for roots, opportunism, or a reaction to the efforts of the blacks, Indians, and Hispanic Americans; there is no doubt that the movement has made considerable headway in

recent years. The white ethnics, however, do not appear to be a genuine danger to the societal integration and order. Mostly their tactics are those used within the system and considered appropriate. Even though Michael Novak and other ethnic leaders have suggested that white ethnic gains have been less than impressive, there is no evidence that the white ethnics are likely to unite in any efforts to upset the status quo. Michael Novak can present figures showing that Poles, Italians, Slavs and Greeks are not very well represented on the boards of large corporations but whether this will make a difference in the composition of these boards is another question. The fact remains that the white ethnics are taking up many of the tactics used so successfully by Blacks, Chicanos and Indians. But, it is also true that these tactics were used by many of the ethnic groups much earlier. The Irish were not averse to the use of force and they were especially adept at the use of political power.¹¹

The case of the minorities, *i. e.*, the Blacks, Indians and Hispanic Americans, which has interested most sociologists during the past two decades, is a different one. First, they are a highly visible group unlike the white ethnic. The white ethnic, if he wishes, can opt out of his group by changing his name and adapting the dominant group's behavior patterns; the visible ethnics cannot. Second, the Blacks, Chicanos and Indians are descendants of either conquered or enslaved people, although this is not really true for all these peoples. Many Blacks were free and the Chicanos that make up the vast majority of the present American population are immigrants or descendants of immigrants, the bulk of them entering the United States during the same period as the so called "new immigrants".

THE VISIBLE MINORITIES

Since 1960 one of the impressive features of American life has been the great concern for the disadvantaged segments of our society. The disadvantaged, too often, have been the Blacks, Indians, and Hispanic Americans. For them the tension between the values of equality and achievement identified by S. M. Lipset as the dominant values of American life has been acute. They are most often the groups who were more or less passed by in the quest for equality and achievement.

Whether it be Indians, Blacks, Mexican-Americans or Puerto Ricans their socio-economic circumstances are dreadful. They live in poverty, have higher infant mortality rates, die sooner, suffer from more illness, live in inadequate dwellings, and have less education. For example, American Indians compared to the general population, have only two-thirds as much income, are ten times more likely to be unemployed, have a life expectancy of seven years less, and an infant mortality rate 50 per cent higher. Mexican-Americans fare not too much better. They face discrimination, have higher unemployment, and may live in abject poverty. The Puerto Ricans' situation is no better. Andrew M. Greeley in his book, *Ethnicity*, presents data that shows the position of Spanish-speaking groups has not changed significantly. They are still at the bottom.¹²

The plight of the Blacks is very well known, and the literature is fast approaching unmanageable limits. Even a cursory review of the literature indicates that the Blacks are now identified with the big cities. The Blacks have been moving into the cities in ever increasing numbers since World War II and the Whites have been in a rapid flight to the suburbs. Whites are estimated to be moving out of New York City at the rate of 50,000 annually. The figure for Chicago is 15,000; and for Cleveland it is estimated at 3,000. As the Whites retreat, the Blacks move in and the estimate is that one-half of all Blacks will soon live outside the south.¹³

The familiar problems are all evident—poverty, non-dominant standards of conduct, language differences and verbal problems, different values, cultural conflicts and low social status, resulting in prejudice, poor motivation, and inadequate self images. Unemployment is much higher for Blacks than whites, reaching dangerously high levels for young Black males. Frequently the mother is the dominant figure and the chief support for the family. Living conditions in the ghetto are abominable for many. Noise and violence are continuing problems.

The Black family of ghetto areas produces more than its share of delinquency, illiteracy, illegitimacy, etc. Most Black families parallel the notional pattern of good behavior and self-improvement, but the pathological end of the Black family spectrum is in desperate need of help. There are a variety of conditions responsible but

too often it is the absence of a father in the home and the circumstance of a deserted wife living with several children in a ghetto flat. Economic conditions, more often than not, play a fundamental part. The father is often unemployed, and his absence from the home may be to allow the family to receive relief. As soon as a man appears in the home, welfare payments come to an end. However one may feel about the problem, there is no denying it is a severe one. Conflict, delinquency, social disintegration are all part of the situation.¹⁴

If achievement and equality are American ideals, the school and education are often considered the keys to realize them. What is the situation in regard to education and the minorities? The most comprehensive recent study is that referred to as the "Coleman Report". This study entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity* dealt with six racial and ethnic groups: Blacks, American Indians, Oriental Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and whites other than Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans. The Coleman report findings are that most American children attend segregated schools and that Black children are the most segregated of the minorities. Their schools are often inferior in respect to some facilities related to possible academic success. Their homes are less likely to have books and encyclopedias. The report summarizes as follows:

Clear differences are found on these items. The average Negro family has fewer children whose mothers graduated from high school: his classmates more frequently are members of large rather than small families; they are less often enrolled in college preparatory curricula: they have taken a smaller number of courses in English, mathematics, foreign languages, and sciences.¹⁵

The situation varies according to regions but this is the basic picture. The Black achievement in school is below that of white children based on average scores from the first grade throughout high school.

The Mexican-American children are similar to the Blacks. They fare poorly when compared to the white group. In the first grade the Mexican-Americans are already behind the Indians and the white groups and far behind the Blacks in verbal achievement. By the fourth grade the children's median grade point on reading

tests were 1·5 grade points below the norm. Ortego presents figures as to Mexican-American's educational status that can only be called shocking. He points out that in Texas thirty-nine per cent of the Mexican-Americans have less than a fifth grade education; and, that Mexican-Americans twenty-five years or older have as little as 4·8 years of schooling. His conclusion is that almost half of the Mexican-Americans in Texas are functional illiterates.¹⁶

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The discrepancies, then, between American ideals and practice result in tension reflected in the social order as more and more individuals become conscious of the frustrations inherent in their positions. Ethnicity has become a vehicle to use in pushing group demands. The Blacks, the Chicanos, and Indians have taken to using violence, politics and the courts to achieve their goals.¹⁷ The Black strategy is instructive. First, they used the courts to push their demands for civil rights, then they moved to violence to achieve civil rights and substantive social and economic rights, at the same time using the ideology of cultural pluralism to push their demands for cultural separatism. Black became beautiful, white seemed to become ugly. Blacks denigrated much of their white culture. Conflicts were escalated to dangerous levels and then gradually muted. In the meantime, Blacks demanded special consideration for years of maltreatment. The values of universalism and achievement were repudiated in favor of particularism and ascription. Blacks were entitled to special treatment—in university admissions, in hiring for jobs usually based on merit, and in other areas.¹⁸ The question becomes: Can cultural pluralism conceived as a form of cultural relativism and ethical relativism be defended in a society holding other values? Does not this position actually jeopardize the stability of the society or is it possible to realize stability while allowing for considerable change in the society's norms and values?¹⁹ Only time will tell.

FOOTNOTES

1. Michael V. Belok, *Forming the American Minds: Early Schoolbooks and their Compilers, 1783-1873* (Agra, India: Satish Book Enterprise, 1973).

2. Joseph S. Rousek, "The American Way of Violence: The Rise of Black Power," in James Van Patton, et. al., editors, *Conflict, Permanency, Change, & Education* (Agra, India: Satish Book Enterprises, 1976), pp. 230-251.
3. Seymour Martin Lipset, *The First New Nation* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967), p. 115.
4. Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951), p. 67. See also his *The System of Modern Societies* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971).
5. Gerald Rosenblum, *Immigrant Workers* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 29.
6. The term "asylum" is suggestive of hidden meaning and social control. See Erving Goffman, *Asylums* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961).
7. Robert E. Park, *The Immigrant Press and Its Control* (New York: Harper, 1922).
8. Andrew M. Greeley, *Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance* (New York: John Wiley, 1974), p. 299.
9. Peter I. Rose, *They and We* (New York: Random House, 1974), pp. 37-60.
10. Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* (New York: MacMillan, 1971).
11. Andrew M. Greeley, *That Most Distressful Nation: The American Irish* (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972).
12. Andrew M. Greeley, *Ethnicity*, pp. 63-73. The *Arizona Republic*, December 10, 1976, reports similar data for 1975.
13. Although the data is not quite clear this appears to be the case. See *Ibid.*, pp. 47-51.
14. Abraham Kardiner and Lionel Oversay, *The Mark of Oppression* (New York: World, 1951), p. 396.
15. James S. Coleman, et. al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966, p. 9).
16. Ortego, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-24.
17. *Arizona Republic* (December 19, 1976). Also see *Arizona Republic* (January 2, 1977).
18. Kevin Phillips, "U. S. seems to be going minority-crazy," *Arizona Republic* (December 6, 1976). See also Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Ethnicity Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).
19. I am indebted to Richard Pratte for the ideas set forth in the last paragraph.

9

Julia Richman: Agent of Change in the Urban School

SELMA C. BERROL

In the library of an old and shabby New York City high school there hangs a photograph of a handsome woman, buxom and wasp waisted in the style of seventy years ago, whose bright brown eyes reflect vitality and intelligence and whose determined chin and erect posture indicate strength and determination.

The portrait is of Julia Richman, teacher, principal, district superintendent and reformer, whose career spanned four decades of New York City educational history from 1872 to 1912. Her long service and extensive contributions to the schools of the city were formally recognized in 1914 when the Board of Education established a new high school at 67th Street and 2nd Ave. and named it in her honor.

The large grey building that bears her name is tangible evidence that Julia Richman was highly valued by her contemporaries. She is also a figure of considerable interest to us today. For one thing, her career tells us something about the opportunities that existed for an educated woman at the turn of the century, information of value to the woman's movement in their search for a usable past. For another, the attitudes she displayed toward her fellow Jews on the Lower East Side and the conflict that resulted, tells us much about the complexity of ethnic relationships,

information of interest to a society which is currently grappling with similar problems. Finally, the educational innovations for which she was responsible tell us a great deal about the changes taking place in the urban school at the turn of the century, a transformation which led directly to the schools of today. Because her career can shed light on three topics which are of considerable contemporary interest, feminism, ethnicity and educational reform, a look at her life and work should be of value.

There is little in Julia Richman's family background but much in her upbringing to explain a life that was atypical for a woman of her time and class. She was born in New York City in 1855, the third of five children of Moses Richman, a skilled glazier who had emigrated from Prague as a young man. The household was middle class in tone, middle European in culture and autocratically ruled by Richman pere. According to her elder sisters, however, Julia was always outspoken and strong willed and as a result was frequently in conflict with her father.

When she was six years old, the family moved to Huntington, Long Island. They stayed for four years but in 1865, although his business had prospered, Moses Richman brought his family back to Manhattan. His wife was lonely and he wanted his children to grow up within a Jewish community. Julia was a particular worry to him because she had led an active, tomboyish life in Huntington and he wanted her to learn proper deportment and social graces. In spite of her father's desires, however, Julia would not become a docile daughter of the bourgeoisie. She would only conform to a point; she was a good student at the neighborhood public school and a devoted member of Temple Ahawath Chesed, the reform synagogue to which her family belonged. After completing grammar school, however, she insisted on taking the five year course given at the Normal College (later Hunter College) in order to prepare for a career.

When she graduated, just before her 17th birthday, she was ready to teach in the public schools of the city. Moses Richman had reluctantly allowed Julia to enroll for advanced schooling but he refused to permit her to teach because very few of the German Jewish girls he knew went to work outside the home. As his older daughters had done, Mr. Richman wanted Julia to stay within the family circle until she married but she was deter-

mined to do otherwise. After failing to get his permission, but hoping to present him with a *fait accompli*, she persuaded the ward trustees who controlled school positions at that time to appoint her to a boys elementary school in Yorkville.

As her father had predicted, this first teaching experience was a disaster because she could not maintain order in the class to which she was assigned. When, after three years, she was transferred to the girls division of the same school, she did much better and was promoted to vice-principal in 1882 and principal two years after that. The latter appointment was a "first" in a number of ways; as the log book of her school pointed out, she was the first Jewish woman, the first Normal College graduate and the youngest person ever to be selected as a principal in New York City public schools. Nineteen years later, she again made history when she became the first woman of her faith to be appointed district superintendent.¹

What does her professional success tell us about opportunities for women at the turn of the century? Did she become an administrator as a result of ability or influence? It could have been the latter; her family was connected socially and by marriage to the Warburgs, Marshalls and Straus's, families of considerable importance among their fellow Jews as well as in city wide affairs. Felix Warburg, for example, was a member of the Board of Education when she was appointed district superintendent.² Or was it rather her own intelligence and intense drive (born perhaps of a desire to prove her father wrong) that led to her advancement? Could it simply be that she was lucky enough to be at the right place at the right time; were women beginning to move into significant careers at this moment?

As with most historical questions, the answer must be multi-faceted. Women *were* beginning to appear in positions of importance in New York City educational affairs. The first woman member of the Board of Education had been appointed in 1886. The Public Education Association (PEA), born out of the "The Great School War" of 1895-96 and very influential in school affairs, was for women only until 1905. Female school administrators were not unknown; Evangeline Whitney was Associate Superintendent for Vacation Schools and Recreational Programs and Fanniebelle Curtis was in charge of Kindergartens. Much of

the leadership for school reform came from the settlement house activists of the period, many of whom were women. Mary Simkhovitch of Greenwich House and Lillian Wald of Henry Street were among the most important but many others wrote in *Survey*, *Charities* and the *Forum* and their ideas were incorporated into the program of the schools. Furthermore, the great majority of lower grade teachers were women and female primary school (kindergarten through grade three) principals were quite the rule.³

On the other hand, women faculty rarely taught the upper grades and with the exception of Washington Irving and Wadleigh (which were for girls only) were almost never appointed to the newly created high schools. Prior to 1920, married women could not teach (unless their husbands were disabled) and there was a considerable salary disparity between males and females until 1912. The PEA women were volunteers, never in paid positions and were completely under the direction of Nicholas Murray Butler, the President of Teachers College. Very few primary school principals ever became administrators of grammar (4th to 6th grade) or intermediate (7th and 8th grade) schools.⁴

In view of these facts, Julia Richman's career was atypical but it would be wrong to see it as a major break-through for women. What it does show is that professional opportunities did exist in the years between 1890 and 1910 which might be filled by a woman who could demonstrate influence, competence and great ambition. Because Julia Richman knew a number of wealthy and active citizens, because she was intelligent and hard working and because she was extremely ambitious, she achieved a meaningful and gratifying career in the schools of the city at a time when such careers were not the rule.

She herself saw her professional success as based on merit alone. There was reason for her to feel this way because, in contrast to most women teachers of her day, she took graduate work at the New York University School of Pedagogy and was the author of two books, *Jewish Ethics* and *Good Citizenship*. Many of her other activities were also noteworthy. Service oriented since young adulthood, she became a leader in several organizations connected with the immigrant Jewish poor. Her work with the Educational Alliance was particularly significant because she was able to act as a bridge between this pioneering

settlement house and the city schools. With her help, the Alliance was able to use public school facilities for their kindergarten and English-to-foreigner classes until these innovations were incorporated into the elementary school curriculum.⁵

In spite of her bent for organizational work, however, she was not active in the most important women's movement of the time. She had little sympathy with the suffragettes and was not much interested in gaining the vote. In a letter to Mayor Strong in 1896, for example, she stated that "Voting is not the highest duty of a citizen." This may have been merely an attempt to ingratiate herself with the Mayor but more likely it reflected her strong desire to separate herself from her female contemporaries.⁶

Her individualism was demonstrated in other ways as well. She was often extremely critical of her fellow workers and never associated herself with any teacher group. It is true that she established a Teachers' Settlement House and even lived there for a time, but she was clearly in charge of the institution and not just one of the residents. In view of her desire to distinguish herself (and thereby demonstrate her superiority to the older sisters of whom her father approved) it is not surprising to note that she was not much of a team player.

In the course of her professional career, for example, she wrote a number of reports for the *Survey*, *Forum* and the *Educational Review*. In each piece, she appears as a female David, slaying the lions of rigidity, incompetence and inertia which were rampant in the schools at that time. The articles deal with *her* ideas, *her* efforts and *her* eventual triumph. As a result, they have a naive, almost fairy tale quality in which Julia Richman alone seemed to have the remedy to the educational deficiencies of her day.

In spite of what she wrote, Miss Richman was only one of many concerned educators and laymen who were disturbed by conditions in the urban schools. Retardation (the child overage for his grade), elimination (early drop-out) and truancy were endemic in the New York City schools. The symptoms themselves were not new but the widespread interest was. For the first time, the "lockstep" pedagogy and the rigid "holdover" (non-promotion) system was found wanting and formal education was now expected to reach more children and provide much more than the

minimum literacy demanded earlier.

Several important underlying forces led to this revolution of rising educational expectations. As American society and urban life became more and more complex, occupational training became more and more essential. Increasingly, as David Tyack has pointed out, the schools were serving as the "gatekeepers to opportunity" and the proper educational credentials became a requirement for entry into the middle class.⁷

At the same time, technological changes were obviating many of the jobs previously available to youngsters with minimal education. As Selwyn Troen has demonstrated, increasing use of the telephone eliminated thousands of messenger boys and the installation of the pneumatic tube in department stores made the "cash girl" obsolete. While it is true that many of these untrained young people could go into other positions that required only a little more education (cash girl into cash register girl, for example), it is also true that with the increased use of machines, fewer unskilled workers would be needed at all. If for no other reason than to keep the unemployed adolescent "off the streets", extended schooling seemed socially desirable.⁸

Furthermore, the first decade of the 20th century saw the heaviest immigration in American history. The influx of newcomers revived many of the familiar nativist concerns and added a new fear of fragmentation. There was widespread belief that the United States could become "balkanized" as had some of the most unhappy portions of Europe. By general consent, the public school was assigned the task of preventing this. The common school was to act as assimilator, to teach the English language and American values to the newcomers and in this way bring them out of their ghettos and into the mainstream of American life.

Unless the educational process could be improved, however, it would not be possible to turn "little aliens" into "little citizens", get the street "arabs" into the classroom or provide the technologically unemployed adolescent with new occupational skills. Although she claimed too much personal credit, it is a fact that Julia Richman, more than many of the other New York City educators of her time, seemed to understand the urban school crisis and responded with new programs designed to reach children who had previously been allowed to fall by the wayside.

While she was still principal of Grammar School 77, for example, she introduced a new system of homogeneous grouping and flexible promotion. Up to that point (1898), all New York City classes were heterogeneous and followed a uniform curriculum. As a critic said, the course of study was the same for the "immigrant child of Rivington St ... who, at the stroke of the clock that makes him of legal working age, must take his place in the ranks of toilers ... and for the well-bred child of Washington Heights whose life is a liberal education and who looks with certainty to high school and college."⁹ Furthermore, children could be "left-back" more than once in each grade. Since the schools had half year promotion, a slow child could be held back very often and reach the school leaving age (12) with no more than a primary education.

Because the classes were very large (until 1905, 60-100 was not unusual) the teachers were unable to help the children who could not keep up with the classical and standardized curriculum. Not surprisingly, such youngsters became truants, drop-outs or "holdovers". Because she was very much aware of the need for more, not less education, Miss Richman was troubled by this waste. In an attempt to remedy the situation, she used teacher recommendations and standardized tests to sort the children into "bright, medium or poor material" and place them into appropriate classes. The best teachers were placed in charge of the worst students (a revolutionary step in itself), the slower children were given modified subjects to study, the marking system was made highly individualized and the time of promotion was based on the child's ability to master the tasks of that grade and not on the calendar.

This early version of what we would call "continuous progress", was by her own estimate, a huge success. The duller children lost their sense of failure when placed with youngsters of similar ability and the bright ones could move ahead more rapidly. Unlike today, when many people see "tracking" as a way to perpetuate class and racial segregation, Miss Richman's move to separate students according to ability and performance was looked upon as an important educational advance. In the 1920's, it became Board of Education policy for the entire school system.¹⁰

Five years after the experiment in flexible promotion, Julia Richman, now Superintendent Richman, devised another plan to individualize instruction. In an article entitled "What Can Be Done in a Graded School for the Backward Child" she described her efforts to extend the concept of homogeneous grouping even further by establishing special classes in all of the schools in her district. There were cram classes for the over-age child who would soon drop out of school, accelerated classes for the very able, "steamer" classes for the newest arrivals and even classes for the retarded.

This kind of classification, which paralleled similar developments taking place in other professions at that time, was designed to improve the efficiency of the educational process so as "to fit the child to be a decent, self-respecting wage-earner and a creditable member of society". In her usual style, Miss Richman heaped scorn upon the teachers and principals who did not follow her lead, calling upon "God or the Board of Education to remove them before greater wrongs may come to the children. Until every principal and every teacher can be made to see that to save the soul and character of the child is a far higher achievement than to obtain a high average in arithmetic, grammar or spelling, it will be impossible to give every child a child's rights."¹¹

The system of special classes pioneered by Julia Richman was adopted by the school system, broadened to include health preservation classes for children with cardiac or eye problems, and established in most of the districts in Manhattan. Somewhat later, she was able to pursue her concept of individualized education still further. In 1905, at her urging, the Board of Education created the first probationary day school in the city. Up to this point, children who were persistent truants or too disruptive to remain in regular classes had been sent (when they could be found) to parental schools which were very much like reformatories. There were never enough of these schools and the ones that existed were designed to incarcerate, not rehabilitate. In the new probationary school, on the other hand, the emphasis was just the opposite. Miss Richman and the ten volunteer teachers she recruited believed that all but a few of the 60 boys who made up the first class could be educated.

To achieve this goal, academic work was kept in the back-

ground and at first the children were given only physical education and manual training. After the staff had earned the children's respect and affection, regular school subjects were introduced. Although the probationary school was only a partial success, it soon replaced more costly parental care and became the model for the "600" schools for emotionally disturbed children which have been a fixture of the New York City educational scene for many years.¹²

As her work with problem children showed, Julia Richman, more than most urban educators of the time, believed that the school must be concerned with the *whole* child, with his health, both physical and emotional, his family life and anything else that affected him and his ability to learn. As she stated in an address to the National Education Association in 1904, she had come to believe that "pedagogy based solely upon theory had outlived its usefulness. Abstract educational theories must stand aside to make room for sociological experiences ..." ¹³

Although she had seen the connection between the classroom and the environment for many years (her sisters said she was as much social worker as teacher and she had taken the position of superintendent on the Lower East Side because she believed that the congested districts below 14th St. were most in need of help) there can be little doubt that her experiences in District I during the first decade of the 20th century made her even more aware that schools were very much a part of society. She saw how terrible crowding in tenement apartments often made study impossible, family crises forced daughters to be truant, poverty led to malnutrition, loneliness and alienation caused sexual misbehavior, and ignorance and fear allowed minor health problems to interfere with school attendance.

Her remedy was a personal one. Going far beyond what was expected of a district superintendent, she personally chased the "loafers" from Seward Park, brought truants into school, rescued wayward girls from the clutches of the madams who ran the brothels on Chrystie St., distributed free eyeglasses and with the support of Felix Warburg, established her own settlement house. Teachers House, as it was called, was the base for one of her favorite innovations, the School and Home Visitor. This was a kindly lady who made visits to the homes of troubled girls,

dispensed charity, made referrals to clinics and when necessary, found jobs. Little escaped Miss Richman's attention; she even began a floating school for consumptives on a retired ferry boat on the East River.¹⁴

Her belief that environmental change would lead to behavioral modification placed Julia Richman in the mainstream of progressive thought. Like Jane Addams and the other humanitarian progressives, she believed that "there were few bad boys, only bad schools".¹⁵ Similarly, she was not frightened by the huge influx of foreigners who entered New York City in the decades during which she was most active, because she was certain, as were Chicago progressives Sophinisba Breckenridge and Grace Abbott, that if immigrant children could be identified upon arrival and made to attend school immediately, their foreign background could be modified with relative ease. In speaking to the National Education Association in 1904, she said "In great cities, where foreign colonies are planted and foreign customs are perpetuated ... the school must step in to *wrest* (my emphasis) not only the child, but the whole family, from traditions which enslave the mind and furnish some of the most stubborn obstacles to a proper assimilation and Americanization of the alien."¹⁶ As her statement made clear, Miss Richman was not flexible when it came to this subject. Indeed, the attitudes of Julia Richman (and most of the humanitarian progressives) are grist to the mill of those historical revisionists who currently maintain that the urban schools were "culture factories" which forced children to abandon their ethnic heritage and adopt standardized American values.

Without a doubt, Miss Richman did not subscribe to the idea of "immigrant gifts" and believed that the foreigners must forsake the customs of their native land. The newcomers, she said, must accept the fact that "the welfare of America demands the proper assimilation of all those conflicting elements that are so generously admitted to our land." If they did not come to such a realization, she threatened, the gates of America would be closed to them.¹⁷

Although she was aware of what sociologists were later to call the "marginal man", she was not overly concerned with the gulf that could result when the child of immigrants accepted American ways but his parents did not. The domestic shipwreck

that might occur, she said, should be prevented by *more* Americanization, directed at the mothers and fathers of the "little aliens." After a time it would be clear that "the foreign parent must cross the bridge to join his child on the American side."¹⁸

Sentiments like these were not mere abstractions to Julia Richman; they were implemented in her daily work on the Lower East Side. She forbade the use of Yiddish in the district schools and engaged in a continuous war against the pushcart vendors of the neighborhood (many of whom were the parents of her pupils) because they flouted the municipal licensing law and remained open on Sunday. By lectures to school assemblies, speeches to the community, letters to both the English and Yiddish press and patrolling the streets in person, she forced the police to pay attention to the offenses of the pushcart owners and make arrests. Like a typical municipal progressive, she saw the corrupt district leader who took bribes from the peddlers as the real villain of the piece but her anger fell on the owners of the pushcarts as well.¹⁹

Her efforts in this regard brought her into direct conflict with the community and in 1908 a petition for her ouster was filed with the Board of Education. The campaign against her was led by labor leader Joseph Barondess who accused her of "constantly and systematically degrading and lowering" the immigrant parents of the East Side in the eyes of their children. He said she had delivered lectures "reviling and maligning the inhabitants of the community, encouraged her teachers to spy upon the children and had taken advantage of every opportunity to suggest to the children that their parents were criminals." The petition concluded by asking the Board to transfer, "this self constituted censor of our morality and patron saint of the slum dweller" to another district because she had "placed herself in an attitude of opposition to the residents and children of the East Side", had shown "publicly and privately her inability to understand our economic problems and was entirely out of sympathy with the needs of this part of the community."²⁰

Barondess was not wrong; Miss Richman had very little liking for the working class Jews of the East Side. She differed from them in class, religious persuasion and culture; her bourgeois, Central European and Reform Jewish background made it

very difficult for her to empathize with her proletarian East European kinsmen. She disliked the religious orthodoxy of some and the socialist sympathies of others. Unlike her contemporary, WASP settlement resident Hutchins Hapgood, author of a loving portrait called *The Spirit of the Ghetto*, Julia Richman saw little to admire on the East Side. In a letter to Warburg she bemoaned "the utter inability of creating a civic conscience in these people ... They have an utter disregard for their duties which is accompanied by a socialistic demand for their RIGHTS." On another occasion, she criticized the Russian Jews for their "ambition to secure positions for which they had no fitness and the contempt they feel for honest labor."²¹

Was self-hatred the cause of her anger? Perhaps. Unlike Hapgood, she could not stand back and admire the colorful life of the ghetto. From her point of view, the pushcarts, operating on a day when respectable New Yorkers were at prayer or at leisure, made her foreign co-religionists seem even more alien. Like many other Jewish "uptowners", Julia Richman deplored the life style of downtown and believed that *all* Jews would be better off when the newcomers joined the mainstream and became Americanized. Her role in the pushcart "war" was part of this attempt to assimilate the greenhorns and teach them the American way.

As a result of her actions, she was nearly forced to resign but after several angry exchanges, she was nearly forced to resign but after several angry exchanges, Barondess dropped the campaign against her and Miss Richman remained, respected if not loved, for another four years. Just as other aspects of her career illuminate aspects of women's history and educational change, her conflict with the resident of the East Side illustrates some of the fallacies in our current thinking about ethnicity. If the more extreme advocates of community control are right, Julia Richman and the people of her district should have worked together very well. As a Jew, she should have understood the problems of the ghetto better than a superintendent of another faith. In reality however, differences of class and culture overshadowed the similarities of religion and as a result, she found it very difficult to relate to the people of the community she had chosen to serve.

This is not to say that she did harm to the East Side; on the contrary, she was an able administrator and accomplished much good. None of her success, however, can be attributed to ethnic matching; a Gentile superintendent with a similar commitment and as much ability would have done as well.

In 1912, after nine active years as superintendent, she resigned her position and went to France for a rest. Unfortunately, she became ill en route and died in Paris. The flags flew at half mast over all the public schools of New York City, several memorial meetings were held and under Warburg's leadership a fund was created to honour her contributions to the city. The tributes were justified; her legacy was a significant one. Most of the educational reform she introduced, such as homogeneous grouping, and special classes for exceptional children are still in use today.

Even her educational philosophy has survived six decades of change. Today, as she advocated, the ideal teacher is expected to do much more than teach skills or content—indeed, Johnny may not know how to read because the modern teacher has been too busy being a social worker and psychologist to teach him. Furthermore, we test and classify children in our schools to a much greater extent than she could have ever envisaged. While she was not alone in originating or advocating many of the changes which transformed the overgrown village schools of the late 19th century into the modern urban systems of the 20th, Julia Richman certainly furthered their development.

Beyond this, however, her story is proof that successful professional lives for women are not an invention of the Nineteen Seventies and her conflict with the East Side community demonstrates the perils of simplistic thinking about race and ethnicity. From every point of view, her life tells us much about the urban past and is a contribution to the urban present.

FOOTNOTES

1. Addie R. Altman and Fertha R. Proskauer, *Two Biographical Appreciations of the Great Educator*, New York, 1916, pp 7-10.
2. Julia Richman to Felix Warburg, January 1, 1902. From the Warburg Collections in the American Jewish Archives of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

3. Abbie Graham, *Grace H. Dodge, Merchant of Dreams*, New York, 1926, p. 159; Sol Cohen, *Progressives and Urban School Reform*, New York, 1964, p. 2; New York (City) Department of Education, *Fourth through Sixteenth Annual Reports of the City Superintendent of Schools, 1902-1914, passim.*
4. New York (City) Department of Education, *Fiftieth Annual Reports of the City Superintendent of Schools, 1948*, p. 48; *Fourteenth Annual Report*, p. 271; Cohen, *Urban School Reform*, pp. 1-3; New York (City) Department of Education, *Directories, 1902-1918, passim.*
5. *Notable American Women*, ed. Edward T. James (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1971) vol. 3, p. 151.
6. Julia Richman to Mayor William Strong, April 16, 1896.
7. David Tyack, *The One Best System*, Cambridge, Mass., 1974, p. 8.
8. Selwyn Troen, "The Impact of Technological Innovation on the Schooling of Adolescents, 1880-1920", paper delivered at the 1974 meeting of the American Historical Association.
9. Thomas Churchill, *The Board of Education*, New York, 1915, p. 107.
10. Julia Richman "A Successful Experiment in Promoting Pupils", *Educational Review*, XVIII, (June, 1899), pp 23-29.
11. Julia Richman, "What Can Be Done in a Graded School for the Backward Child", *Survey XIII*, (Oct. 1904), pp. 129-131. Quotes are on p. 131.
12. Julia Richman, "The Incorrigible Child", *Educational Review*, XXXI, (May, 1906), p. 484-506.
13. National Education Association, *Proceedings & Addresses of the 44th Annual Meeting, 1905*, p. 118.
14. Ms. *Budget for Resident and Social Work at 9 Montgomery St.*, May 1, 1910 - April 30, 1911; Julia Richman to Felix Warburg, June 10, 1910. In the American Jewish Archives.
15. Julia Richman "The Incorrigible Child", p. 484.
16. National Education Association, *Proceedings, 1904*, p. 115.
17. *Ibid.* p. 120.
18. *Ibid.* p. 119.
19. Julia Richman to Felix Warburg, no date (probably, May 1908) and Julia Richman to Felix Warburg, April 25, 1912. In the American Jewish Archives.
20. *Petition to the Board of Education, New York City*. In the American Jewish Archives. Confirmation that Baroness was the author of the petition in Moses Rischin, *The Promised City*, New York, 1964, p. 239.
21. Julia Richman to Felix Warburg, April 25, 1912. In the American Jewish Archives.

10

The Influence of Ella Flagg Young on John Dewey's Educational Thought

JOAN K. SMITH

Jane Dewey had this to say with reference to her father's view of Ella Flagg Young: "He regards Mrs. Young as the wisest person in school matters with whom he has come in contact in any way."¹ Their paths first crossed when the 36 year old professor had just returned from a nine month trip abroad to take up his duties as head of the Department of Philosophy, Psychology, and Pedagogy at the University of Chicago.² It was the fall of 1895 and Ella, a 50 year old District Superintendent in the Chicago Public School System, was toying with the idea of entering the world of higher education for the first time— having previously acquired a normal school diploma. She later recalled the events leading to her nine year association with Dewey in this way :

I was told that in order to enter Mr. Dewey's course I should have to present a permit signed by him. I looked up the long flight of stairs of Cobb Hall and watched the eager faces of the young people and decided that ... I should not take up the work. As I turned to leave some young man who knew me by appearance stepped up and offered to go upstairs to Mr. Dewey and get his signature for me. So that's the way I happened to enter the University of Chicago.³

She continued in Dewey's afternoon seminars for a period covering four years studying such topics as Ethics, History and Theory of Logic, and Hegel's Philosophy. In the fall of 1899 she devoted her full time to studying for her Ph. D. and teaching as a lecturer of Pedagogy.⁴ Upon finishing her dissertation entitled "Isolation in School Systems" she graduated and went on the staff as a full professor in Dewey's department.⁵ From the time of her graduation in the summer of 1900 until she left the university in the spring of 1904, her duties and responsibilities included the following: teaching in the Department of Pedagogy and occasionally in Philosophy; supervising in Dewey's Laboratory School; and acting as the anonymous managing editor of the journal entitled *The Elementary School Teacher*.⁶

When Professors Dewey and Young left the university in the spring of 1904 their nine year association had borne both of them much fruit. For the 59 year old educator (who was devoted to improving public education) it gave an intellectual point of view, a philosophical base that justified what she already knew experientially. For the 44 year old professor (who had just collaborated with colleagues to launch a new philosophical system of which William James spoke favorably) it gave practical meaning to a set of theoretical conceptions.⁷ In fact, she became to him a sort of living proof for the doctrines of a reflective type of thinking and an experientially based ontology. A description of their lives up to this point will produce a clearer picture of what each brought to the relationship at the University of Chicago. This will be followed by a more detailed explanation of the form which her influences took.

I

Ella's parents were both of Scottish-Presbyterian descent. Theodore and Jane Flagg were described as hard-working, thrifty, and honest people with religious convictions that left no room for dogmatism.⁸ Although her father's formal education was brief—he was apprenticed to the sheet metal trades at the age of 10—he was an avid reader and when independent thinking produced conclusions that were at odds with religious doctrine, he tended to reject the latter. While Ella's mother was more conventional in her religious thinking, she did believe that the attitude of the home should not be so strict as to drive the old and young away to find

amusements. Consequently, card-playing, dancing, theater-going, and reading contemporary books were encouraged by her parents.

The youngest of three children, Ella was born on January 15, 1845 in Buffalo, New York. She spent the first 10 years of her life fighting to gain independence from her mother's conviction that she was a "delicate child". She was kept out of school and at home in the sunshine doing gardening chores and visiting her father at the forge. She grew to dislike gardening, but the visits with her father she loved. By the age of 10 she had taught herself to read and write and had apparently outgrown her delicate condition, for she was allowed to attend school.

From the start, school was an intriguing place to her. She liked it and did well. She particularly excelled in math, as did her father, and soon she was asked to assist the teacher in math classes. An interesting note to her character development occurred through her father's observation that she was developing a "priggish attitude". When he learned that her desk had been moved up next to the teacher's in order that she might better assist, he instructed her to move back with the rest of the students and do her assisting from there.⁹

By the time Ella was 13 she had completed her grammar education and the family was on the move to Chicago where job opportunities were supposed to be better for her father. Not having graduated from a Chicago grammar school, Ella could not enter the regular high school curriculum, so at 15, after passing a test for teacher certification but being too young to teach, she was entered into the normal department and graduated two years later. This two year course offered no practical experience, so Ella set up her own practice teaching situation by making arrangements with a local teacher who was willing to let her teach once a week during her last year in the normal department.

In the fall of 1862 the 17 year old neophyte teacher was requesting that she be given the roughest and most undisciplined class in one of the Chicago grammar schools. After eight months of her teaching, the class was said to be typical in manner and achievement, and the young teacher was headed for a promotion to head assistant of a larger school. It was here that she became interested in teacher training and the latest instructional methodology which happened to be Sheldon's object method—an out-

growth of Pestalozzian principles. This interest led her to develop a complete course of study based on this method for all grade levels in science. The course was subsequently included in the curriculum.

Two years later she was named principal of a newly opened practice school. Although the superintendent's reports of her work were glowing, school board politics soon interfered with her freedom to judge effective teaching, and after certain pressures were brought to bear, she resigned her position and went to teach math in one of the high schools.¹⁰ For the next five years she taught math and just assisted in the practice school. By this time she had married a local merchant, named William Young, who was many years her senior. Due to his ill health and eventual death shortly after the marriage, Ella continued in her career, and by the age of 31 she was heading up one of the grammar schools of Chicago. She apparently took to the principalship as she had to the other aspects of her career, for in 1879 she was asked to take the leadership of one of the largest grammar schools in the city. It served a very heterogeneous social class population, so before she accepted she spent much time walking through every neighborhood that it served until she became familiar with the people, the activities of the community, and the demands that would be made upon a school located in such a district. Only when she was convinced that she understood the situation did she accept the position. She also became the first female principal to pass a certifying exam. Up until that time it had not been required of women, but when she came out at the top of the list of scores, the rule was changed.

During her principalship the school was known for employing the best techniques available in educational procedure. Mayor Carter H. Harrison Sr. remarked that he thought it was the "most effective social institution in the city."¹¹ She adamantly opposed the use of corporal punishment and sent memos to her teachers reminding them of this. Yet, she gave her teachers freedom and flexibility to devise their own methods of teaching and conducting classes. She was fond of saying that "no one can work in another's harness."¹² An upper grade history teacher developed an approach for teaching the constitution that was considered to be rather innovative for the time: a miniature house of Congress

was constructed by the students who then debated contemporary issues. She continued to enrich herself and her staff by providing mental stimulation in the form of evening study groups which became very popular with the faculty. Its topics ranged from English and Greek drama to psychology, ethics, and philosophy.

In 1887 the 42 year old teacher-turned-administrator became actively involved in the Principals' division of the NEA. Although women were not able to sit on the convention floor or to vote, they were allowed on the platform, and she delivered her first paper at the 1887 convention in Chicago. Her topic, "How to Teach Parents to Discriminate Between Good and Bad Teaching" captured the experiences of her 25 year career. Ideas like these were expressed : good teaching results when we can get on a high plane of thought, arrive at a definite conceptualization of what we are trying to accomplish, and then act in accordance with the results of clear thinking being certain that our aims and methods will give satisfactory results.¹³ Indeed this sounds like a simple almost obvious set of observations. Yet, if "high plane of thought" is replaced with "reflective thinking" the impact of Dewey's intellectual point of view on her ideas becomes clearer. Also, one can see that the typified a unification of thought and action for him. If he could have implemented practically what he knew intellectually, and if he could have applied this framework to the field of education, her influence would have been lessened.

In the same year that she first addressed the NEA, Principal Young became District Superintendent Young, and for the next 12 years she continued the same type of administrative practices in her district that she had in her schools. The study group or institute became a popular involvement for teachers in her district, because as some members said, "She is a fascinating speaker" with a good sense of humor. And "the meetings were so enjoyable because the leader herself was the best learner in attendance."¹⁴ Her great effectiveness as a teacher lay in her ability to draw her students into meaningful discourse. By 1899—the year that she left to do full time work at the university—these teacher institutes had heard lectures from William James of Harvard as well as John Dewey and James Angell both of Chicago. The meetings championed the cause of democratic representation for all educational groups, and they eventually led to the founding

of the Chicago Teachers' Federation which demanded this representation for the teachers in the system. In fact, her dissertation on isolation was referred to by Margaret Haley, a CTF leader, as "the *Bible* of the teachers of the United States on the question of academic freedom".¹⁵ Such were the experiences to date that shaped the woman whom Dewey regarded as educationally wise. Up to this point, through her studying and teaching, she had consistently tested out her knowledge gained in the realm of practical experience. In other words, she was a practicing pragmatist—a progressive educator.

II

A return to 1859 for a sketch of John Dewey's life will provide an interesting comparison. While Ella was deciding whether or not to continue her studies in the normal department of the Chicago High school, the third of four sons was being born to Archibald and Lucina Dewey on October 10, 1859.¹⁶ John's parents came from three generations of Vermont farmers, & it took Archibald to break with that tradition by opening a grocery store in Burlington, Vermont. Yet, being from an old New England family John had ample opportunity to fraternize with the town's elite, wealthy, and educated. The young boy did not start school until he was almost nine, because the family was on the move during the Civil War. Upon their return to Burlington, however, he was quickly enrolled. Unlike Ella, he found school intermittently boring, but he did well and was allowed to advance rapidly. He surpassed his age group, completed grade school by the age of 12, and continued into high school taking the college prep or classical course. During these years he was described as quiet and reserved with a developing fondness for books and the out-of-doors. His father was considerably older than his mother, and apparently took less of an active role in the upbringing of his son. Nevertheless, John recalled hearing stories from his father's youth and accounts of his Civil War experiences. His mother, on the other hand—although described as kind and generous—was more concerned with and restrictive in his moral and religious upbringing. While she allowed him freedom in his studies and outdoor activities, she frowned on his playing ball and marbles on Sundays; condemned dancing, card-playing, and gambling; and was continuously asking whether or not he was

"right with Jesus". Later on, he would write, "Religious feeling is unhealthy when it is watched ... to see if it exists ... It is as fatal ... as it is to pull up a seed from the ground to see if it is growing."¹⁷

The way out of this moral and religious dilemma came, ironically enough, through the church in Burlington. Her ministers, who were also philosophy professors at the University of Vermont, told of an evangelism more liberal than his mother's. But the dualisms of flesh *versus* spirit were still a source of disturbance to the young man. It was, however, the beginning of his deep and lasting interest in philosophical questions.

After completing high school at the age of 16, he entered the University of Vermont that following fall and graduated four years later in the spring of 1879. During his first three years his marks were not outstanding, but in his senior year his courses dealt more with philosophical concepts so that his average was raised enough to win him election into Phi Beta Kappa. The intuitionist philosophy which he studied in college was wrought with the dualism of reason *versus* intuition. Yet the popular contemporary alternatives of materialism, agnosticism, naturalism and humanism (which he avidly read in his encounters with English journals), were still too foreign for him to accept.

Not really knowing what he would do when he graduated, John probably felt some sense of gratitude when a cousin offered him a high school teaching position in Oil City, Pennsylvania. For two years he taught small classes in algebra, Latin, and the natural sciences. In 1881 he accepted a teaching job in a small academy in Charlotte, Vermont and continued his study of philosophy by reading and through long talks with a former university professor. It was during this time that his long acquaintance with William T. Harris began. He sent two articles critiquing the latest philosophies to Harris' *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, and he offered to assist Harris in any way that he could with the journal. Knowing Latin, he also volunteered to translate for him. Both of his articles were published by the summer of 1882. During that same time he decided to pursue graduate work in philosophy at The Johns Hopkins University, and from this time through his early appointments at the University of Michigan (and briefly at the University of Minnesota) he embraced the following

philosophies primarily in an intellectual, rather than emotional capacity: Neo-Hegelianism or Absolute Idealism with its stress on the unity of existence, and then Humanistic Naturalism with its emphasis on the continuity of nature. The classes that he taught reflected these intellectual changes, and the consensus among students seemed to be that he was not a very good lecturer. Most descriptions from former students were of the following variety: questions were not invited; he was not dynamic; he seldom made eye contact; and he was "cold, impersonal, and petrifying to flunkers". Student James Angell, who would later be Dewey's colleague at the University of Chicago, wrote "Dewey, with countenance ageless as stone, ever recalling the north frigid zone."¹⁸ However, one of his students, Alice Chipman, must have been impressed with the 26 year old professor who was one month her junior, for in 1886 she married him.

In 1889 upon the death of his good friend and mentor, George S. Morris, Dewey was called upon to head up the Department of Philosophy at Michigan. He remained as head until 1894 when President William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago offered him the position of Head of the Department of Philosophy, Psychology and Pedagogy. Teaching philosophy and psychology would not be new to him, since they were in the curriculum at Michigan. An account of the influences that shaped his philosophical thought has already been described; but with respect to psychology his conceptions were more recent. Under G. Stanley Hall at Johns Hopkins, he had studied the functional psychology of Wundt and Hall. Now, at the University of Michigan, he was in close association with George Herbert Mead and Alfred Henry Lloyd. Both of these men had studied experimental psychology and pragmatic thought at Harvard under William James and Josiah Royce. Besides this, they had studied in several of the leading German universities of the time including Gottingen where Herbart ended his career.¹⁹

The area of pedagogy, however, though interesting to him, was a largely untapped and foreign ground for Dewey. One only has to look at his publication record to this date to realize the truth in this latter statement. Of the three that pertain to education, two relay the results of a survey on the health of women in higher education—the survey being conducted by an association for the promotion of women in higher education; and the third discusses some of

the ramifications for including psychology in the high school curriculum.²⁰ It must also be remembered that the study of pedagogy as a discipline was relatively new. Indeed, the influence of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart had been felt; but until now, little had been done to put the underpinnings of the new experimental philosophy to the social institution known as the public school. The time was right for the paths of Dewey and Young to cross: he with his philosophical base; and she with her 33 years of experiencing all functional aspects of the schools.

III

So now the specific outcomes of this influential relationship are left, and some are more obvious than others. For example, she suggested the title of Laboratory School for his elementary school—a place where the latest educational expertise could be tested and verified—so that parents would have a clearer understanding of the differences between it and Colonel Francis W. Parker's model or practice school which had come to be associated with the university by 1901. Also, when certain weaknesses had become apparent, she helped reorganize this Lab School.²¹ Then too, she was the only one to write about education in the publication which James referred to as evidence of Chicago's school of thought.²² But, perhaps Dewey's own estimate of her influence is most telling. In a letter to John T. McManis, a former student and colleague of Young's, he revealed the following:

Regarding my relations with Mrs. Young: First, it is hard for me to be specific, because they were so continuous and so detailed that the influence resulting from them was largely insensible. I was constantly getting ideas from her. In the reorganization of the laboratory school after certain weaknesses in its original scheme of administration had become apparent (due largely to my inexperience in administrative matters), her influence with that of Mrs. Dewey's were the controlling factors. It then ... ran so much more systematically and definitely—free from a certain looseness of ends and edges—in its last three or four years.

In my opinion what Mrs. Young got from her study of philosophy was chiefly a specific intellectual point of view and terminology (the two things can't be separated, for terminology with a person like Mrs. Young is a very real thing, not a verbal

one) in which to clear up and express the practical outcome of her prior experience and a greater intellectual assurance. This led her in many respects to overestimate the explicit content of my own teachings. That is, she gave me credit for seeing all of the bearings and implication which *she* with her experience and outlook got out of what I said. As a student I should say her chief mark was the ineradicable tendency to test all philosophic formulations by restatement of them in terms of experience—and this is not the conventional “experience” of philosophy, but a very definite experience of what the doctrine would mean if attempted in practice—the difference it would actually make in the way of looking at other things than philosophy. She had by temperament and training the gist of a concrete empirical pragmatism with reference to philosophical conceptions before the doctrine was ever formulated in print. Another thing that impressed me was the range of her experience—its scope, and her habitual attitude of openness to everything which would enrich it

Apart from the suggestions, which were so numerous that I couldn't name them, what I chiefly got from Mrs. Young was just the translation of philosophic conceptions into their empirical equivalents. More times than I could well say I didn't see the meaning or force of some favorite conception of my own till Mrs. Young had given it back to me—I am referring even more to association with her as a colleague than when she was a student. And as I have already intimated, she generally as a matter of course that I had the point in mind from the start

I owe chiefly to association with Mrs. Young the depth of my conviction that all psychology which isn't physiological is social

In general, I should say that I have hardly known anyone who made the effect of genuine intellectual development the test and criterion of the value of everything as much as she.²³

Beyond this their influence upon each other seems to have stopped. In 1904 when they both left the University of Chicago John Dewey went on to become an international spokesman for a pragmatic approach to education; and Ella Flagg Young became the first female superintendent of the Chicago Public School System (1909–1916) as well as the first female President of the

NEA in 1910. However, Dewey's ability to integrate pragmatic thought to action remained less well developed than Young's as evidenced not only by reactions to his teaching styles and techniques, but also his administrative activities. Besides his difficulties as Lab School head, he also had trouble uniting Colonel Francis W. Parker's faculty with his. He vacillated between being too authoritarian to being too apathetic, and the faculty was torn with conflict, turmoil, and jealousies.²⁴ What lingered out of their association for him was a greater understanding of how pragmatism could be applied to the field of education.

FOOTNOTES

1. Jane M. Dewey, ed., "Biography of John Dewey," in Paul Arthur Schilpp, ed., *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. The Library of Living Philosophies, vol. 1, 2nd Edition (LaSalle, Ill.: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1951) : 29.
2. George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey* (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), p. 79.
3. John T. McManis, *Ella Flagg Young and a Half-Century of the Chicago Public Schools* (Chicago : A. C. McClurg and Co., 1916), p. 102.
4. Ibid., pp. 102-11; Rosemary Donatelli, "The Contributions of Ella Flagg Young to the Educational Enterprise" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago Microfilms, T 22517, 1971), pp. 145-50. Donatelli assumes that Mrs. Young did not teach before she graduated, but McManis and letters written by Ella, herself, contradict this position. See Young to Harper, 2 December 1899, Presidents' Papers, 1889-1925, Box 54, Folder 25, Archives, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Illinois.
5. The University of Chicago, The President's Report : Administration, 1st Ser. *The Decennial Publications* 1 (Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1903) : 38.
6. Donatelli, p. 147; Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, *The Dewey School : The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896-1903* (New York : D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936), pp. 3-19; Young to Harper, 7 November 1903, Presidents' Papers, 1889-1925, Box 71, Folder 2.
7. Gay Wilson Allen, *William James: A Biography* (New York : The Viking Press, 1967), pp. 435-36 citing James to Schiller, 8 April 1903.
8. The biographical data on Ella Flagg Young is taken from McManis, pp. 15-100. Brief sketches appear in *Dictionary of American Biography* 1936 ed., s. v. "Ella Flagg Young", by Charles H. Judd; *Notable American Women*, 1972 ed., s. v. "Young, Ella Flagg", by Judy Suratt.
9. McManis, p. 23.

10. Ella had recommended that a particularly "untalented" student should not continue in the practice school. However, this student happened to be a friend of one of the board of education members. See McManis, p. 51-2; Department of Public Instruction. City of Chicago. *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Education for the Year Ending December 31, 1870* (Chicago: Board of Education, 1870), pp. 71-2.
11. McManis, p. 61.
12. Ibid., p. 60.
13. Ella Flagg Young, "How to Teach Parents to Discriminate between Good and Bad Teaching", *The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association* (Salem, Mass.: National Education Association, 1888), pp. 215-49.
14. McManis, p. 117.
15. Margaret A. Haley Papers. Unpublished autobiography, Version IV, 1934-35, p. 199. In Chicago Teachers' Federation File, Boxes 32-34. Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois.
16. Biographical information on John Dewey is taken from Dykhuizen, pp. 1-115; Jane Dewey, pp. 3-36.
17. Dykhuizen, p. 7.
18. Ibid., pp. 56-7; Reginald D. Archam'ault, ed., *Lectures in the Philosophy of Education, 1899, by John Dewey* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1966), pp. xxxiv-xxxv.
19. Dykhuizen, p. 65.
20. Fredson Bowers and Jo Ann Boydston, eds., *The Early Works of John Dewey, 1882-1898*, 5 vols. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969-1972).
21. McManis, p. 120; Mayhew and Edwards, pp. 8-12.
22. University of Chicago, *Investigations Representing the Departments*, Part 2 of the *Decennial Publications*, 1st Ser., 3 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1903): 5-155.
23. McManis, pp. 119-122.
24. For accounts of his administrative activities see Robert McCaul, "Dewey and the University of Chicago", *School and Society* in 3 parts, 89 (25 March, 8 and 22 April, 1961): 152-57, 179-83, 202-06; Robert Eugene Tostberg, "Educational Ferment in Chicago, 1883-1904" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1960, University Microfilm # 60-5798), pp. 201-29; Jack K. Campbell, *Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), pp. 236-37; Dykhuizen, pp. 111-15; Nellie Lucy Griffiths, "A History of the Organization of the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago" (M. A. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1927, Microfilms, T 786564), pp. 100-10; Dewey to Flora J. Cooke, 9, 18 June, 21 November, 3 December, 1902, 4 February 1904, and John Duncan to Cooke, 8 May 1903, Parker Papers, Flora J. Cooke Folder, N. d., Chicago Historical Society, Chicago Illinois.

11

Women's Clubs and Hearts in the Bid for Progressive Education

JACK K. CAMPBELL

The response of the women's movements in the 19th century to the cultural hand of discrimination, which stacked the cards in favor of men, has been well studied, but its impact on educational reform has been lost in the shuffle.¹ In the initial bid for what would be called "Progressive Education," women's clubs may have been trumps in the play for its wide-spread recognition. Some spokewomen for the clubs which federated in the last decade of the 19th century and mobilized seminine sentiment were associated with male leaders of the new education. Moreover, they all had a psychological stake, and possibly an initiating influence, in the movement which would overthrow the authoritarian role of the schoolmaster and make the schoolhouse a "home" in the egalitarian image they wanted to project. Women's hearts, as well as clubs, may therefore have been the long suit in the sentimental impulse of the new education and in its innovative mode of child-rearing practices. This bid to liberate children from the restrictions of traditional schooling surely had for its natural partner the movement to free women from their bondage of tradition, especially the traditional burden of child-rearing which had become more burdensome with the decline of the extended family and the loss of numerous surrogate parents.

While the women's movement was diverse and spanned the political and social spectrum, this study will view educational reform from the perspective of women's clubs in the late 19th century and from their patrician orientation. As women of influence in the social hierarchy, with middle and upper class values, their clubs may have contributed a class bias to progressive education, a bias that educational revisionists have recently attributed to that movement. The revisionists, however, have not focused on the distaff side of the movement or the fact that women, even those of high social stratification, shared political and social discrimination with the lower classes, and therefore viewed the world from a similar angle of vision, or at least from a sympathetic slant.

As representatives of more than sixty women's clubs from the various states were hastening toward New York City in April of 1890 for the ratification convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Workingwomen's Clubs were already in session in that city. The difference between these two groups was discerned by the *New York Times* in its April 24th editorial. The former group was composed of "societies" which enjoyed all the comforts of a home that money could buy. They were not workingwomen in any strict sense of the term, "though busy women they undoubtedly are." The latter group was a device to secure the "comforts of a home," which the wages of individual members would not allow.

The "call" for the General Federation of Women's Clubs had been initiated the previous year by the New York City woman's club, Sorosis, as it was celebrating its twenty-first birthday and coming into its "majority." That club probably pioneered the modern organization of women's clubs in 1868 when its founder, Mrs. J. C. Croly (Jennie June) was denied, because of her sex, admission to the New York Press Club's dinner for Charles Dickens.² Sorosis, and succeeding clubs that followed its lead, stressed self-education for its members rather than radical feminist sentiments, though the clubs all became involved in philanthropic and charity endeavors.³ In 1889, when Sorosis dreamed of federation with other clubs, its call had brought scores of delegates to New York City. Mrs. Ella Dietz Clymer, of Sorosis, was elected president, and a constitution was framed which had for its

object "to bring into communication with each other the various women's clubs throughout the world, in order that they may compare methods of working and become mutually helpful". A committee of correspondence was appointed to convene all known women's clubs for a ratification convention in 1890.⁴

Meanwhile, the Workingwomen's Clubs, which were convening in New York City a few days prior to the proposed General Federation of Women's Clubs, had originated in a department of the New York State Aid Charity Association. Miss Grace H. Dodge was the chairman of one of its committees which led to a system of Working Girls' associations. The first club, organized in 1883 by Miss Dodge as the Thirty-Eighth Street Clubs of Working Girls, was planned on the model of all women's clubs— every member to have equal rights, every important issue decided by vote of the whole body. Its object was to furnish pleasant rooms where members could pass the evening, to organize classes and studies for mutual enjoyment and improvement. Practical "talks" and various entertainments were to form "a beautiful relationship of sisterly union". By 1890 New York City had eighteen such societies and it was at their annual convention that other clubs throughout the country were invited to join in bonds of unity. Over 600 delegates were counted as the convention opened on April 15, 1890 in the Assembly Rooms of the Metropolitan Opera House. Miss Dodge, chairman, called the meeting to order and talked on "Practical Tasks; Their Function". Topics of household affairs, womanhood, motherhood, dress, politics, home duties, and influence of women over men were discussed rather than presented in traditional lectures or readings of papers. The general tone of the sessions sounded the note of education and cooperation, with greetings from the General Federation of Women's Clubs extended by Mrs. Clymer.⁵

When the General Federation of Women's Clubs met on April 23, 1890, a series of papers were read on "women's possibility", including one by Miss Grace Dodge. Mrs. Croly, first historian of the General Federation, revealed that there was a sincere effort at that time to affiliate the working girls' clubs, but that the refusal came from the "executive" of the General Federation. Mrs. Croly believed that the "desire for obliteration of the lines of separation which had existed between the different kinds

of work in the world was not understood." She also thought the ladies may have been afraid that patronage was intended.⁶ Indeed, the *New York Times* had warned the girls to guard their independence from the "lady patronesses," who were amateurish and working women only by courtesy.⁷

By the time Mrs. Croly was writing her history of the club movement, seven or eight years later, she claimed that working girls' clubs and associations were allying themselves with State and Local Federations of women's clubs and becoming a part of the "great movement".⁸

Nevertheless, class lines were drawn between women of leisure and labor. There is no doubt that the ladies of leisure sympathized with their working sisters (and brothers) as evidenced by their charitable works. They may have opposed "lower class" politicians who they thought were abusing the charitable institutions with graft and patronage, and they may have wanted to take these institutions out of such hands and place them in more professional or upper class boards of trustees.⁹

Sympathy and charity have the advantage of proceeding from the superior to the inferior. This must not have occurred to the ladies, but the *New York Times* could be more charitable to the working girls than to the lady clubbers. It sympathized with the working girls, obviously less threatening to the male aristocracy. The working girls, the *Times* commented, only want "our sympathy," which was readily granted. It was easy to sympathize with women whose "unhappy fate" was to earn their own living instead of following their natural vocation of marriage. More such clubs were said to be needed in order to further legislation in their behalf. They were only concerned about the hire of rooms in back streets, but the women clubbers could take "sumptuous luncheons at Delmonico's". The editor thought women were "clubbable," and ladies, as well as men, had the right to have such clubs and dine at Delmonico's (scene of the Astors, Vanderbilts, charity balls and debutante parties), but why should they insist on an ulterior motive of advancing women's emancipation "vague and fallacious pretensions" just for enjoying the "gross and carnal act of dining?"¹⁰

While class lines were distinguished by the press, and possibly by a number of women clubbers, it should be recognized that

"unity in diversity" had become the motto of this group from the beginning. Mrs. Croly believed this meant "sympathy with what one does not like."¹¹ Such a motto had the advantage of avoiding partisan stands which would alienate and divide. Women of left and right, high and low, could identify to some extent with this organization. In any event, a platform had been raised for the concentration of women's views. Mrs. Croly's journalistic gifts in *The Woman's Cycle* could carry those views into many homes. Furthermore, the women were now organized to petition friends in both houses of congress and various state legislators. Were their views on education, however, united in support of a new education or equally diverse? Did they perceive that the new education was actually an attack on aristocracy?

Colonel Francis W. Parker, the leading exponent at that time for a "new departure" in education, believed that traditional education was "class" education, inherited from aristocracies of the past. It was therefore inherently alien for a democracy.¹² It is significant that Miss Grace H. Dodge, equally at home in the Workingwomen's Clubs and in the General Federation, was active in promoting an education which would meet the needs of the lower classes.

No working girl herself, Miss Dodge was born into the New York family of Phelps-Dodge wholesale metals, and was educated by governesses. Devoting herself to social work and children's aid, in addition to Workingwomen's Clubs, she was also active in the Kitchen Garden Association which promoted domestic arts among the laboring classes. Even before her appointment to the New York City Board of Education, she was concerned about the preparation of teachers for domestic arts. If the public schools were to serve the needs of lower class children, they would need teachers with more than academic training. She found support from F. A. P. Barnard, president of Columbia College, but he could not interest his academic faculty in teacher training, except for one Nicholas Murray Butler, then a professor of philosophy. Butler, later president of Columbia University, worked with Miss Dodge as she managed to raise money for the establishment of the New York College for the Training of Teachers. Later it was united with Columbia as Teachers College, with Miss Dodge on its board of trustees. Its dean, James E. Russell, claimed that it

was Miss Dodge's faith which kept Teachers College alive.¹³ Significantly, the training of domestic arts was the foundation for Teachers College which grew into the Mecca for progressive education under its prophets Dewey and Kilpatrick.

Perhaps the ladies of the General Federation would approve domestic and industrial arts for the children of their servants, and Protestant pulpits must have lectured them on the redeeming virtue of work, but it is an interesting irony that strands of progressive education were eagerly picked up for their own children. Progressive education would fare better with the higher classes and their private schools than in the public domain.¹⁴ Even Colonel Parker had to give up his herculean efforts of holding progressive methods over the Chicago schools and withdraw into the patronage of Mrs. Emmons Blaine, McCormick heiress, to salvage his theories in a private institute. Dewey's Laboratory School, with its kitchens and shops, later merged with Parker's Institute in the University of Chicago, was heavily supported by its tuition-paying patrons.¹⁵

There was a philosophical bond between many leaders of the General Federation and the new education. Mrs. E. D. Clymer, who addressed its first convention, was a living link with the communitarian experiments of Robert Owen and Frances Wright. There in New Harmony, Indiana, the seeds were planted for achieving a new society through a new education. Mrs. Clymer, raised in New Harmony and president of its Minerva Club when she was only sixteen, was also the niece of Robert Dale Owen's wife.¹⁶

The New England Woman's Club of Boston, which hesitated at first to federate in 1890, but later joined and became a leading cog in its wheel for woman's progress, was led by Julia Ward Howe.¹⁷ In addition to her affiliation with "high society" and her literary fame, she brought intimate insights from all that was progressive in Horace Mann. She and her bridegroom honeymooned with the Mann's in Europe and enjoyed a life-long association.¹⁸ The New England Woman's Club, which was founded in the same year as New York's Sorosis, had Ralph Waldo Emerson as one of its first speakers. When Mrs. Howe succeeded to its presidency in April of 1875, at the same time Colonel Parker was initiating his Quincy methods in a Boston suburb, the reception for her predecessor included Miss Elizabeth Peabody, Bronson

Alcott and his daughters, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Lucy Stone, William Lloyd Garrison and a host of other Bostonian notables.¹⁹

Transcendentalism, abolitionism, and women's rights all came together in this club. Elizabeth Peabody, especially, brought a devotion for Alcott and Mann to its literary meetings, as well as her kindergarten theories which were such an inspiration for the child-centered and socialization philosophy of the new education.

The Chicago Woman's Club, called a "model" club by Mrs. Croly and noted for its tenement reform, woman's rights, charitable institutions, and compulsory education, had for its members Jane Addams and Ella Flagg Young, as well as the wives for Chicago tycoons. It also claimed for a member the wife of Colonel Francis W. Parker as chairman of its education department.²⁰ The Parkers had left Boston in 1883 to make Chicago the "stormcenter" of the new education, and Mrs. Parker was a "new woman" in every sense of the word, as well as a contributor to her husband's educational theories.²¹ Perhaps "Colonel Parker" was even outranked by "General Federation" in the campaign to overthrow traditional education.

Parker's "Talks on Pedagogics," delivered at his own Cook County Normal School, Chautauqua assemblies, and Miss Dodge's New York Teachers Training College, were brought together under hardback in 1894 to broadcast across the land a gospel of child-centered pedagogy and a "science" of education. It also documented his support for women's rights and for co-education of the sexes.²² Though he published, he might have perished if it were not for the ladies. Traditional educators and partisan politicians, always at work against him, had all but toppled him from his commanding position at the Cook County Normal School in 1895 when the county withdrew its support and the Chicago Board delayed its acceptance until the Colonel and his progressive cohorts tired of teaching without pay and would resign. The women's clubs took to the press, besieged the Board with delegations, and finally one board member told reporters he wanted the Normal School and he wanted it quickly. "Any man who wants to be popular with the ladies would better join the board of education these days," he said. And again in 1898, when Mayor Carter Harrison tried to maneuver the Colonel out of his Normal School stronghold, he found teas and receptions a "perfect terror."

And the Colonel hung on.²³

It was to this Chicago scene that the General Federation of Women's Clubs repaired for its first Biennial meeting in 1892. The women's descent on Chicago crowded the horse-cars and made the downtown restaurants unendurable for gentlemen, though the *Tribune* saw these women who stood at the head of the club movement as more interesting over a cup of frappe than as advocates of woman's advancement or other "frivolous" subjects.²⁴

On the evening of May 11, 1892, amid palms, cut flowers, and mandolin strings, the club ladies held a reception at the Art Institute for Susan B. Anthony. Miss Anthony was introduced as one who had done more clubbing and been clubbed more than any other. She received a prolonged applause.²⁵ The hammering of a woman's suffrage plank into the club women's platform brought the executives into secret session. What went on there was privileged information, but the suffrage issue did not emerge. What the convention came up with was the aim of advancing "the best good of the family and the State, the overthrow of all forms of ignorance and injustice, and the application of the Golden Rule to society, customs, and the law." As the ladies finished their business, over all fluttered the blue ribbon badges with the symbol of a sun rising from waves. Women without clubs were weak as water. Federated, they were strong as waves.²⁶

And the waves went on swelling. The council meeting for 1893 again met in Chicago, amid the bustle of the Columbian Exposition that transformed Chicago into the city of light that attracted all kinds of women's congresses. Mrs. Potter Palmer of the Chicago Woman's Club was president of the Board of Lady Managers for the Exposition and hosted the grand reception for women at the Auditorium on May 18, 1893. Women from all representative groups were there. Society ladies of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and San Francisco were especially observed in their black silk trimmed with white and their white drape trimmed with satin. This reception by the Chicago Woman's Club was described in the *Tribune* as a "crush".²⁷

Later that evening, the women suffragettes were reported in a "love feast" in Hall 3 of the Woman's Building while at the same time the General Federation of Women's Clubs held its

department congress in Hall 7. Separate rooms did not divide the ladies. Women of all persuasions seemed united as never before, though some "hair pulling" and a few petty jealousies were reported by the press. The *Tribune* not only praised the Woman's Congress in general as an "unqualified success," but even said it would "put to blush" those who believed in the mental inferiority of women.²⁸

One could fault the General Federation for failing to take a stand on race relations or to admit ladies of color, but its expansive thrust had to accommodate all regions of the country.²⁹ It was not a closed issue, however. The Chicago Woman's Club resolved on November 14, 1894, that condition of membership would hold no race distinction.³⁰ It was left to such women as Mrs. Booker T. Washington, however, to form a Colored Women's League and the National Association of Colored Women to work for the welfare of underprivileged women of that race, and thus the women's clubs were racially as separate as the fingers of the hand.³¹ Both groups must have supported vocationalism so characteristic of the new education.

The second Biennial in 1894 found the women marching on Philadelphia and electing Mrs. Ellen M. Henrotin, of the Chicago Woman's Club, to their General Federation presidency. Wife of the prominent Chicago banker, Mrs. Henrotin has been called one of the truly social feminists in the early club movement.³² She was president when the women met in Louisville for their third Biennial in 1896, at which time a motion was made to make the improvement of public education their primary effort. The Public Education Association, which united many social reformers, was considered a direct result of the women's efforts in Louisville.³³

In 1897, when addressing the National Educational Association, Mrs. Henrotin said the woman's club movement was distinctly educational and that it most logically looked to the "new education" because it recognized that education is not limited to the school alone. She portrayed the latter part of the 19th century as a scene distinguished by two great movements—popular education and the woman's movement: Both, she said, were interdependent.³⁴

We need not take the train reserved exclusively for women

that chugged the Eastern ladies up the continental slope to the Denver Biennial in 1898 to find that child training was still on the main track.³⁵ That same summer, Miss Margaret J. Evans, who would be elected first vice-president of the General Federation in 1900, spoke to the National Educational Association. Her script could have been a page out of Colonel Parker. She documented the work of "Women's Clubs as an Educational Factor," by showing their efforts to improve the appearance and health of the schoolroom and their support for household economics and manual training. She said the clubs promoted free kindergartens, fostered Mothers' Clubs, parents' and teachers' leagues, and child-study classes. She emphasized their union with teachers' associations at local and state levels, and how they asked what the homes may do to help the schools. She was also concerned about what the schools may do to help the homes. In her special concern for moral education, which the women considered of vital importance, she recommended that the National Educational Association make it a matter for committee investigation. She argued in progressive fashion that preaching would avail little morality. The instruction, she insisted, would have to be made concrete, with illustrative examples adapted to the age and experience of the pupil.³⁶

There were approximately 160,000 women enlisted in the General Federation at this time. Miss Evans said conservatively that at least 100,000 homes were being educated by their club study.³⁷ (Census data for 1900 would indicate that about one out of every 140 white households were thus directly influenced.)³⁸ What was this club study? In *Women's Club Work and Programs*, compiled from *Woman's Home Companion* articles, we find discussions of issues from the peace movement, woman's suffrage, prohibition, and modern health to the improvement of children's education. We find advice on home management and how to entertain the children. We find the view that parents should be friends to children and work as a team.³⁹

It is this new view of the home that may have captured women's hearts and led them to capture the schools. In 1889 the *New York Times* introduced "woman's rights" to its "uninitiated public" as representative of the "progressive female philosophy". Women were then assembled to hear about the failure of marriage,

about its relationship between tyrant and slave which should be changed to companionship.⁴⁰ Traditional education, like the traditional family, may have been a relation between tyrant and slave. Could the "new woman" fail to see the connection?

Lloyd Demause argues that "the central force for change in history is neither technology nor economics, but the 'psychogenic' change in personality occurring because of successive generations of parent-child interaction."⁴¹ He posits a periodization of modes for such parent-child interaction which evolved progressively from the infanticide mode of Antiquity to the helping mode of the mid-twentieth century. He recognized that parents could be "stuck" in earlier historical modes, and that class and regional differences are important. The general mode for the 19th and early 20th centuries, he found, was characterized as the socialization mode.⁴² Such a mode is often associated with progressive education, even by its critics of life adjustment.

The fission of family organization from the extended to the nuclear mode had provided industrialization with smaller and more mobile units, easier to control and manipulate. This changing pattern placed more child-rearing responsibility on the mother, as well as other limitations, and may have even triggered the feminist movement earlier in the 19th century.⁴³ Furthermore, no such small unit could cope with the socialization of the child in a more and more complex environment. Hence, Dewey's definition of the school as a legatee institution that would have to assume all the educative aspects lacking in a changing society relates meaningfully to the breakdown of the traditional family.⁴⁴

More study of child-rearing and child-care practices by the home and by state and federal agencies is needed, but the fact remains that the socialization of the child gravitated away from the home and into the school as the 20th century wore on. It was such a schooling of society that has given pause to the deschoolers, as well as to those who believe the schooling movement was not really motivated by egalitarian sentiments, or genuine concerns for freedom.

It could be argued, however, that women of all ranks, but especially those of the lower classes, might benefit from outside help in the schools, if only as custodial services. At the same time, it could be argued that women of rank were being influenc-

ed by new child-rearing theories which stressed more parent-child interaction. These women were interested in a "resting place" outside the home which their clubs could provide, but they also argued that "getting away a little" was good for mothers, children, and husbands.⁴⁴ It would be important for them to make sure the education of children outside the home was more humane in discipline and conducted along close personal ties between child and adult which their club studies advocated. Consequently, class and color lines, which the women clubbers found hard to cross, may be apparent in progressive education.

Frank Riessman's "Culturally Deprived Child," finds progressive education alien to his culture. Riessmann wonders why "in light of his pragmatic, non-abstract, orientation" such a child would not prefer the approach that aims at "learning by doing." The deprived child, he believed, needs this physical approach, with concrete, experience-centered learning, but the most popular and effective teacher for him is the "old-style" strict and highly structured model.⁴⁵ He believed the progressive approach does not work because of:

"the permissiveness; the accent on self—the internal—the introspective; creativity and growth as central goals of education; the stress on play; the underestimation of discipline and authority. All these values are contradictory to the traditional attitudes and personality characteristics of the deprived."⁴⁶

It would seem, after all, that the progressive educators, even with good intentions, projected their own child-rearing practices on the lower classes, but the emphasis on the pragmatic and concrete may have been more in line with the needs of the lower class than with their own.

A recent study of sex role and social behavior, which used Kohlberg's three ideological positions or types—cultural transmission (traditional school), romanticism (free school à la Rousseau), and progressivism (interaction à la Dewey)—found that the progressive mode encouraged new sex roles and provided a better partnership between adults and children in the learning process than any of the others. It also had a greater incidence of positive opposite-sex interactions among children.⁴⁷ Perhaps women clubbers had intuitively sensed this in progressive education

from the beginning.

All this is to suggest that some of the impetus for progressive education lay in women's hands, especially those who held high social advantages, and that their clubs provided a vast audience and an impelling force for its development. It may also suggest that women's hearts belonged to a new order which would unrank men, women, and children, and make school and society, like the idealized home, more egalitarian and harmonious for all.

FOOTNOTES

1. Michael B. Katz points out the need for such study in his *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools. The Illusion of Educational Change in America*, New York : Praeger Publishers, 1975, p. 150.
2. J. C. Croly, *The History of the Woman's Club Movement in America*, New York : Henry G. Allen & Co., 1898, pp. 15, 85.
3. William L. O'Neill, *Everyone Was Brave. A History of Feminism in America*, Chicago : Quadrangle Books, 1971, pp. 84-90 ; Mildred White Wells, *Unity In Diversity. The History of The General Federation of Women's Clubs*, Washington, D. C. : General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1953, pp. 29-30.
4. J. C. Croly, pp. 85-86, 91, 98 ; "For All The Clubs," *New York Times*, March 21, 1889, p. 5.
5. "The Welfare of Women," *New York Times*, April 10, 1890, p. 2 ; "Working Girls' Clubs," *New York Times*, April 18, 1890, p. 4 ; "Women's Clubs in Session," *New York Times*, April 24, 1890, p. 5 ; J. C. Croly, p. 82 ; "Grace Hoadley Dodge," *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930, pp. 346-347.
6. J. C. Croly, pp. 82-83, 97 ; "Meeting of Women's Clubs," *New York Times*, April 23, 1890, p. 9.
7. "Working Girls' Clubs," *New York Times*, April 18, 1890, p. 4.
8. J. C. Croly, p. 83. See also Board Minutes, September 30, 1891, Chicago Woman's Club, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois.
9. Board Minutes, October 8, 1890, Chicago Woman's Club.
10. "Society Topics of the Week," *New York Times*, January 13, 1889, p. 13 ; "Working Girls Clubs," *New York Times*, April 18, 1890, p. 4 ; "Women's Clubs," *New York Times*, April 24, 1890, p. 4.
11. Mildred White Wells, pp. 2-3.
12. Jack K. Campbell, *Colonel Francis W. Parker : The Children's Crusader*, New York : Teachers College Press, 1967, pp. 69, 129-146 ; Francis W. Parker, *Talks On Pedagogics*, New York : E. L. Kellogg and Co., 1894, pp. 401-451.

13. "Grace Hoadley Dodge," pp. 346-347; Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961, pp. 170-171. See also Alice Henry, *The Trade Union Woman*, New York: Burt Franklin, 1973, for discussion of women's demands for industrial training.
14. This conclusion may be inferred from Lawrence A. Cremin's definitive study of progressive education in *The Transformation of the School*. The "Eight-Year Study" may also have been initiated to assure upper class patrons of progressive schools that their children would succeed in college.
15. Jack K. Campbell, pp. 199-210, 225.
16. Mildred White Wells, pp. 5, 16, 259.
17. J. C. Croly, p. 91.
18. Jonathan Messerli, *Horace Mann. A Biography*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972, pp. 384, 386; "Julia Ward Howe," *Dictionary of American Biography IX*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932, pp. 291-292.
19. J. C. Croly, pp. 37, 52. For Colonel Parker's work in Quincy, see Jack K. Campbell, pp. 75-93.
20. J. C. Croly, p. 62; Board Minutes, March 26, 1890, May 2, 1890, Nov. 19, 1890, Dec. 17, 1890, Feb. 18, 1891, Feb. 25, 1891, Oct. 28, 1891, Dec. 2, 1891, Nov. 2, 1892, Feb. 8, 1893. Feb. 15, 1893, April 5, 1893, Chicago Woman's Club; "Noted People There," *Chicago Tribune*, May 19, 1893, p. 11. For a definitive biography of Ella Flagg Young, see Joan K. Smith, "Ella Flagg Young: Portrait of a Leader," unpublished dissertation, Iowa State University, 1976.
21. For a review of Mrs. Parker's work, see Jack K. Campbell, "Colonel Parker's New Woman and the New Education," *McGill Journal of Education*, X (Fall 1975) 150-168.
22. Francis W. Parker, pp. iii, 420-421.
23. Jack K. Campbell, *Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader*, pp. 177-194; Jack K. Campbell, "Colonel Parker's New Woman and the New Education," pp. 160, 162.
24. "Women in Session," *Chicago Tribune*, May 11, 1892, p. 5; "Given a Reception," *Chicago Tribune*, May 12, 1892, p. 1.
25. "Given a Reception," *Chicago Tribune*, May 12, 1892, p. 1.
26. "In Secret Session," *Chicago Tribune*, May 13, 1892, p. 1; "Work of the Women," *Chicago Tribune*, May 14, 1892, p. 12; "Given a Reception," *Chicago Tribune*, May 12, 1892, p. 1; "Women Meet Today," *Chicago Tribune*, May 11, 1892, p. 5.
27. "Federated Clubs Have a Session," *Chicago Tribune*, May 19, 1893, p. 4; "Noted People There," *Chicago Tribune*, May 19, 1893, p. 11.
28. "Woman's Suffrage Discussed," *Chicago Tribune*, May 19, 1893, p. 11; "Federated Clubs Have a Session," *Chicago Tribune*, May 19, 1893, p. 4; "Praised Women's Congress," *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1893, p. 12; "Women Shed Tears," *Chicago Tribune*, May 5, 1893, and "The Warring

- Women," *Chicago Tribune*, May 7, 1893, for running account of feuds.
29. William L. O'Neill, p. 87.
 30. Board Minutes, Nov. 14, 1894, Chicago Woman's Club.
 31. Sophonisba P. Breckinridge, *Women in the Twentieth Century. A Study of Their Political, Social and Economic Activities*, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933, p. 24.
 32. J. C. Croly, p. 148; Mildred White Wells, pp. 54-58; "Charles Henrotin," and "Ellen M. Henrotin," *Who Was Who In America*, I, Chicago: Marquis Who's Who, Inc., 1960, p. 551; William L. O'Neill, p. 104.
 33. J. C. Croly, p. 181; Lawrence A. Cremin, p. 86.
 34. Ellen M. Henrotin, "The Co-Operation of Woman's Clubs in the Public School," *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, National Educational Association*, 1897, pp. 73-83.
 35. Mildred White Wells, pp. 404-405.
 36. Margaret J. Evans, "Women's Clubs as an Educational Factor," *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, National Educational Association*, 1898, pp. 237-243.
 37. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
 38. *Historical Statistics of the United States*, Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1960, p. 16.
 39. Caroline French Benton, *Woman's Club Work and Programs, or First Aid to Club Women*, Boston: Dana Estes and Company, Publishers, 1913. See especially p. 66. It is interesting that country teachers were encouraged to join, if possible, at least one woman's club and take part in its programs. See Frank J. Lowth, *Everyday Problems of The Country Teacher*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946, p. 74. (Its first edition came out in 1926.)
 40. "Marriage of the Future," *New York Times*, January 7, 1889, p. 8.
 41. Lloyd Demause, "The Evolution of Childhood," *History of Childhood Quarterly*, I (Spring 1974) 505, 553-556.
 42. William L. O'Neill, pp. 3-4. See also William J. Goode, *The Family*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964, and William J. Goode, *World Revolution and Family Patterns*, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
 43. See Dewey's discussion of the ideal home and how it has to be enlarged in John Dewey, "The School and Society," *Dewey On Education*. Martin S. Dworkin (ed.), New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1959, p. 53; Lawrence A. Cremin, p. 117.
 44. Board Minutes. February 1, 1893, Chicago Woman's Club.
 45. Frank Riessman, *The Culturally Deprived Child*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962, pp. 14, 72, 124.
 46. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
 47. Laura E. Berk and Nancy G. Lewis, "Sex Role and Social Behavior in Four School Environments," *The Elementary School Journal*, 77 (January 1977) 205-217.

Samples of the American Feminine Mind : Focus on Mary Whiton Calkins as Philosopher

1. INTRODUCTION AND ORIENTATION

Although Anne Hutchinson stands as America's first feminine thinker, nevertheless, coming as she did during the seventeenth century when women were given very few opportunities, for our purposes a few remarks will suffice.¹ Much as we admire her theological abilities, her defense of religious freedom and her magnificent courage, it is also true that she was intensely emotional and lacked the intellectual acumen which we find in the five women whom we shall consider in this article.

In order to give our readers the widest possible perspective, it is probably best to begin by taking a glance at four noteworthy feminine thinkers who were not primarily philosophers but rather were engaged in closely related fields. Consequently the following have been chosen: Margaret Fuller, Jane Addams, Edith Hamilton, and Georgia Harkness. Then we shall consider America's greatest feminine philosopher, namely, Mary Whiton Calkins, the student of both William James and Josiah Royce, much more thoroughly. Finally, in terms of a fit conclusion, an attempt shall be made to view the above five women in perspective.

2. FOUR NOTEWORTHY, INFLUENTIAL FEMININE MINDS

(1) (*Sarah*) Margaret Fuller Ossolini (1810-1850)

This gifted, talented woman is best known as Margaret Fuller.

She came from a very interesting family that was known both for its vigorous independence of thought and its intellectual pursuits.² Interestingly enough, her father treated her like a son and introduced her to the classics while she was still a child. She went to the Prescott School at Groton, Massachusetts; and, even though, at that time women could not attend Harvard, while the family was living at Cambridge, she became acquainted with some of the most outstanding students.

In 1836 she met Emerson—that great event which affected her life and thought so profoundly. During 1836–1837, besides teaching at Bronson Alcott's Temple School, she also read German with Channing, and thus prepared the way for her translation of that famous work: *Eckermann's Conversations with Goethe*. After serving as Editor of the transcendentalist journal, the *Dial*, she became the literary critic of Greeley's *New York Tribune*. In 1846 she sailed for Europe, met and married her true love, the Marquis d' Ossoli, in 1848—and later, while he fought in the revolution, she ran a hospital. After the failure of the revolution, she and her husband and infant son sailed for America and perished in a storm on July 19, 1850.

There are actually two aspects of Margaret's thought which deserve mention. The first involves her social concern finding superb expression in her efforts for the rights of women. Wade, in fact, speaks of her thought-provoking, challenging essay—*Woman in the Nineteenth Century*—as “a landmark in the history of feminism”. He also tells us that it had a marked effect on the feminist movement; that is, particularly insofar as it “paved the way philosophically for the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 and the woman's rights movement of later years.”³ The second aspect is, of course, her mysticism which led her to transcendentalism. Thus, in her *Dialogue, Free Hope* testifies: “All my days are touched by the supernatural.” In a similar manner, *Self-Poise* even speaks of the “spirit-world” looking in at one's “window with moon-lit eyes.”⁴ In short, while Fuller revolted against the old, rigid, obsolete orthodoxy, as a mystic and transcendentalist, she had a profound faith in God. Her spirit is, in fact, best expressed in the following gem: “Always the soul says to us all, cherish your best hopes as a faith, and abide by them in action.”⁵ This brings us to another important feminine figure. This is none other than Jane Addams.

(2) *Jane Addams (1860-1935)*

Jane was born in Illinois in 1860. Two persons—her father and her stepmother—proved a real inspiration to the young girl. At Rockford Female Seminary, since her bold, original mind could not accept the prevalent religious fundamentalism, she went through a period when she was forced to struggle with a legion of doubts. In spite of this, however, she graduated as valediction of her class in 1881. Then she enrolled in the Woman's Medical College in the city of Philadelphia. Unfortunately she became ill and depressed. Although a trip to Europe with her kind stepmother brought only temporary relief, during a second trip abroad the great miracle of finding her vocation occurred. Strangely enough, it occurred during a bullfight: for the sight of bloodshed made her realize that, in order to find inner peace, she must try to help suffering humanity as a social worker. Consequently she and Ellen Starr established a center at Hull House in Chicago where she became a ministering angel to large numbers of recently arrived immigrants.⁶

Furthermore, with her social vision, besides working for such causes as juvenile courts, pensions for mothers, temperance, woman suffrage, etc., she became an ardent pacifist. As such she founded the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom. Although she was much maligned by narrow-minded super-patriots during World War I, instead of compromising with the militarists, she actually tried to stop this insane War by attempting to bring together a Conference of Neutrals. Nor must we forget that, in spite of her failure to stop this madness, in 1931, along with Nicholas Murray Butler, she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.⁷

Charles Darwin, probably more than anyone else, caused her to question the prevalent fundamentalism.⁸ While she was likewise influenced by Herbert Spencer, yet, since she rejected his deterministic interpretation of evolution, his influence was largely negative.⁹ Her reading of Edward Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, as well as her later visit with him at Oxford, served to strengthen her idealistic tendencies: for this great Hegelian idealist helped her to grasp a meaningful vision of the wonder of the evolutionary process as a whole. Addams was also influenced both by Comte and by her friend, John Dewey.

Besides her profound interest in ethical religion—for, unlike

Dewey, she never rejected theism—there is her very important social philosophy. Actually it involves the following three significant aspects: (1) her concept of democracy as both ethical and social; (2) her concrete rather than abstract concept of justice; and (3) a strong pragmatic factor due largely to Dewey's influence. In the light of the above then, we summarize Jane's philosophy in terms of the following words of Anne Scott: "Darwinism, 'experience', pragmatism, and personal value."¹⁰ This leads us to the third feminine thinker, Edith Hamilton who, in contrast to Jane, is an outstanding classicist.

(3) *Edith Hamilton (1867-1963)*

Edith was reared in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Under the direction of her father, she not only read Greek and Latin early, but also read the classics for pleasure. She also mastered French and German. After attending Miss Porter's finishing school, she went to Bryn Mawr. After taking her B. A. and M. A. and then remaining another year as fellow in Latin, she received an European Fellowship which enabled her to study at both Leipzig and Munich. Upon her return she taught at the Bryn Mawr School at Baltimore. She remained there as an inspiring teacher until 1922, when she resigned in order to give the rest of her long life to writing. Her chief work, *The Greek Way*,¹¹ actually began with the publication of a series of important essays. During the latter part of her life, she was highly honored. To crown it all, the Greeks made her an honorary citizen of Athens.

Like the other two women considered above, Edith ranks as a pioneer in the cause of women's rights. More than this, she had the courage to break into two leading German universities which—up to that time—were male preserves. Interestingly enough, her own personal views were certainly colored by the Greek love of Truth and Beauty, their passion for freedom, and their emphasis on self-control, self-knowledge, and their moderation in terms of the Mean. In fact, she loved to quote these great words of the Oracle at Delphi: "'Know Thyself' and 'Nothing in excess'".¹² Again, her descriptions of the great Greek philosophers are illuminating.

In spite of her admiration for the highest outreaches and up-reaches of the Greek mind, she was not less apt at portraying the negative aspects. So far as Athens is concerned, she did this in

a masterly way in her book: *The Echo of Greece*. In short, Athens failed because, instead of listening to her wisest teachers, she became greedy, intoxicated with power, and, in allowing her individualism to run riot, she lost her sense of balance and seethed with a corruption that smelled to high heaven. Moreover, most important of all, our classicist subjected American culture to criticism in the light of the failures of Greece. Along with the neglect of the classics, Miss Hamilton deplores the presence of the cult of primitivism and sheer ugliness as found in modern poetry and art. Similarly the following two sentences from her *Echo of Greece*, reveal her awareness of the dangers inherent in American individualism and license: "Unlimited freedom is chaos. It would destroy mankind."¹³

While her contributions to the understanding of Greece display an astonishing creativity, she was far less able in formulating her own philosophy. In truth, her personal point of view, especially as expressed in her essay, "This I Believe," reveals a combination of mystical intuition and pragmatism with little attention to the claims of reason.¹⁴ This is far less true of the person whom we shall consider next, Georgia Harkness, the theologian.

(4) Georgia Harkness (1891-1974)

This outstanding woman, of whom it was said that she opened theology to women, was born at Harkness, New York as the youngest of the four children of Joseph and Lillie Harkness.¹⁵ After receiving her B. A. from Cornell, she taught Latin and French in several high schools. She received her M. A. and Ph. D. degrees from Boston University later—and this led to her career as a college professor. In fact, she taught at the following: Elmira College, Mt. Holyoke College, Garrett Theological Seminary, Pacific School of Religion—and for a year at Japan International University. Besides all this she is the author of over 30 books. She died in 1974 at the ripe age of 83.

Although Dr. Harkness' philosophy as a whole—which centers in her theology—finds its best statement in her earlier book, *Conflicts in Religious Thought*,¹⁶ she sums it up most tersely and concisely in her later book: *Mysticism: Its Meaning and Message*.¹⁷ In this book, she speaks of her theology as "my middle-of-the-road Christian liberalism."¹⁸ While, as a theist,

Harkness believes that God reveals himself in many ways, she also believes that He revealed Himself *supremely* in that long process of religious development—which, although it had its beginnings with the primitive ideas of the ancient Hebrews, found its *very highest* expression in Jesus as the culmination of that unique, creative emergent that began with the great Eighth Century Prophets.

Her use of the term “middle-of-the-road”, of course, indicates that she is neither a fundamentalistic, orthodox conservative nor a humanistic, left-wing, naturalistic radical. Interestingly enough, in her little book, *Foundations of Christian Knowledge*, she speaks of liberalism as “primarily a spirit and a method rather than a body of Christian beliefs.”¹⁹ Suffice it to say that such liberalism opens the door for meaningful relations between the great religious systems—meaningful relationships which, as over against the past dogmatism, have much to offer “the coming world civilization.”²⁰

As a social thinker, along with her broad, ecumenical vision, there is Harkness’ devotion to world peace. Indeed, in his memorial statement, Tyler Thompson informs us that “she had a special interest in the application of the Gospel to the problems of peace and world order.”²¹

From Harkness, the theologian, we now turn to Mary Whiton Calkins, the metaphysician. By virtue of being the greatest feminine thinker that America has produced thus far at least, we shall consider her at greater length than the other four. For, besides studying under America’s two greatest philosophers, her stature as a creative thinker is certainly evident in her well-formulated system—as we shall see in what follows.

3. MARY WHITON CALKINS (1863-1930)

Mary Whiton Calkins was, above all else, a professional philosopher and metaphysician.²² Her chief book, *Persistent Problems of Philosophy*,²³ in fact, went through five editions. More than this, her philosophy has been called “the finest flowering of the American mind” during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth.

Mary was born at Hartford, Connecticut as the oldest of the five children of Wolcott and Charlotte Calkins. On her mother’s

side she claimed John and Priscilla Alden as her ancestors. She spent most of her childhood at Buffalo, New York where her father, a graduate of Yale and Union Theological Seminary, was pastor of the Presbyterian Church. Later, however, he accepted a call to the Congregational Church at Newton, Massachusetts—and Mary entered the local high school. The title of her graduation essay was—"The Apology Which Plato Should Have Written: A Vindication of the Character of Xantippe"—which indicates an early interest both in philosophy and in the rights of women.²⁴

After her graduation from Smith College (where she specialized in Greek and in philosophy), while on a trip to Europe with her family, she decided to become a teacher. Later she studied philosophy with both Royce and James and also psychology under the direction of Münsterberg. Unfortunately, in spite of having passed the examination with distinction, due to male prejudice against women, Harvard would not grant her the Ph. D degree. Eventually, however, she received an honorary degree from both Smith College and Columbia University.

Although she studied psychology extensively and even had the honor of establishing the first experimental laboratory in any women's college, little by little, she was drawn to philosophy. Moreover, she was fascinated with metaphysics. As a result, the last and most fruitful years of her life were spent in teaching and writing chiefly in the field of philosophy. Fortunately, in spite of being a woman, her achievements in psychology, as well as in philosophy, did not go unrecognized. Thus, while in 1905 she was elected President of the American Psychological Association, by 1918 her achievements in philosophy had become such that she was elected President of the American Philosophical Association. Besides her many articles and her masterpiece, *The Persistent Problems of Philosophy*, two Calkins' other books must also be mentioned: *A First Book in Psychology* (which went through four editions; and her book on ethics: *The Good Man and the Good*. Since she became a victim of cancer, her last years were very difficult.

Besides the early influence of her father and the influence of her three famous teachers, there was also the influence of that great psychologist and opponent of behaviorism, William McDougall. Last but not least, there is the impact of the great

classical idealists from Plato to Berkeley, Kant, and Hegel. As an *absolute idealist* along with the influence of Royce, there is, of course, the presence of Hegel.

What follows concerning the essence of her philosophy is based both on her illuminating essay, "The Philosophical Credo of an Absolutistic Personalist,"²⁵ and her *Persistent Problems*. Since her essay contains such an excellent epitome of her point of view, we shall begin by taking a good look at it.

The primacy of metaphysics strikes the reader immediately. For she makes it clear that by philosophy she means metaphysics and that by the latter she means the search—by means of reason—for what is "ultimately real".²⁶ She also makes the following clear: (1) her rejection of that type of mysticism which has no place for reason; (2) her recognition that the metaphysician might fail in his quest; and (3) the fact that her system differs both from Russell's "logical atomism" and from Dewey's pragmatism. Finally, she presents the fundamentals of her system in terms of the following four basic aspects: (1) the fact that the universe contains "distinctly mental realities"—which cannot be reduced to anything non-mental; (2) the mental and the personal, rather than the material, as primary since they constitute the *first datum* of all experience; (3) her idealistic view of the Universe as a Whole; and (4) her concept of the Absolute as the Supreme Self "of which all the lesser selves" are actually "members". Here, in truth, the Indian mind will find an interesting combination of the basic principles of Sankara and Ramanuja.

Her chief book carries the following suggestive subtitle: *An Introduction to Metaphysics Through the Study of Western Systems*. Moreover, her aim is to provide students with a means of studying the fundamental problems of philosophy "under the guidance of the great thinkers." As a drastic criticism of both Pragmatism and Neorealism and, likewise, as an excellent summary and defense of her version of Absolute Idealism, the section designated as "Conclusion" is superb. To begin with, here she carefully distinguishes her Absolutistic Personalism from all impersonal, pantheistic systems.

Even more important are the two interesting arguments which she presents for her own system. The first is Royce's well-known

argument based upon the implications of the fact of error. Her statement of this argument may be epitomized as follows: The very fact that I can make errors implies the reality of an intelligible order or system of Truth— by means of which I can test my own conceptions ; and this suggests the existence of an “absolute knower” who makes possible and upholds this *valid, objective* realm of Truth. For Truth has no meaning apart from all minds of a high order ; and, since it claims an objectivity that transcends the power of the human mind to bestow this objectivity, we must conclude that it owes this *objectivity* to the operations of a Supreme Mind.

By means of her *second* argument our philosopher defends her system against the charge of subjectivism and solipsism. Thus she contends that, along with the awareness of the self as a tough, primary fact upon which idealism builds, there is also always the awareness of something that stands over against the finite, human self. In fact, this experience of *encounter* and *discovery*, unlike illusions, instead of vanishing when subject to criticism, persists. This experience of encounter is especially persistent not only when we encounter other human beings, but also when we find ourselves hindered by certain stubborn objects and forces. In short, like the fact of an objective realm of Truth by means of which we can correct our faulty human concepts, this experience of encounter, discovery, and hindrance is best explained in terms of the presence of the Absolute or God. This becomes even more certain when we try to account for another tough, constant fact : that is, the discovery of the many complex ways in which things seems to hang together, to be related—all this plus the order in terms of which they operate. Consequently, in view of the fact that blind matter, at the basis of which lies an erratic, destructive energy, cannot account for these stubborn facts, we are driven to that GREAT FACT in which idealism finds its objective basis, namely, God as the Absolute.

What then is the nature of this rather hidden Absolute in which “we live, and move, and have our being”? Here, to be sure, as we have already seen, Miss Calkins, as a personalist, answers that the Absolute is really God as the *Supreme Self*. Nevertheless, she is never guilty of crude anthropomorphism. For, as a philosopher, she is quick to remind us that, since the possession of bodies is a mark of our human finiteness, this Supreme

Mind and Will must not be conceived in any crude, anthropomorphic manner. While God is like us in that He is self-conscious and personal, in other ways He is transcendent and supreme. If He were not transcendent and supreme as well as personal, instead of being the Absolute, He would merely be a kind of Superman—like the gods as conceived by the ignorant polytheist who fails to grasp the significance of the profoundly monistic character of the Universe. It is clear then that Calkins conceived the Universe, like her great teacher, Royce, "as a Great Society" composed of God and the many lesser selves.

Now that we have this profound feminine philosopher's system as a whole before us, how shall we evaluate it? In spite of the fact that it contains so much that is valid and significant in the very highest sense of the word, like Royce's Absolute Idealism, it involves two basic weaknesses or shortcomings. The *first* is that to most philosophers, it seems to be too monistic. After all, since the Universe continually produces particulars and individuals, its *pluralistic* aspect must be given due consideration. Moreover, confronted as we are with mind versus matter, with Truth versus error, with good versus the bad, and with change versus changelessness, no philosophy can claim to be adequate, if it cannot give a reasonable account of this strange dualism which comprises a significant part of the world process. The *second* weakness is very closely related to the first. This again, as in the case of Royce, involves her failure to give an adequate account of the problem of evil. For, if the teleological facts are omnipresent, so are the irrational, erratic, dysteleological facts.²⁷

Although Calkins is not as original as Royce and certain other philosophers of what has been called the Golden Age of American Philosophy, nevertheless, she remains the greatest American feminine thinker for many reasons. To begin with, as a *metaphysician*, she stands as a brave feminine pioneer in a field that is so difficult that few women the world over have as yet dared to attempt to fathom its mysterious depths. But the torch held high by this courageous pioneer will surely serve as a challenge to the great feminine minds of the future. This is especially true in view of the fact that creative minds, such as that of Errol E. Harris, have not only exposed the shallow superficiality of our logical positivists and analysts as well as the

dangerous irrationalism of our extreme existentialists, but have also paved the way for new and greater attempts to solve the riddle of existence.²⁸

Again, especially in the light of her criticisms of Hume and the neorealists, Calkins must be ranked high as an incisive, sound critic. Nor, when we consider her most important book—which still stands as a philosophical monument—can we complain that she was lacking in creative philosophical speculation. Likewise her skill as a teacher and the fact that she served as President of both the American Philosophical Association and the American Psychological Association bring added testimony to her genius. Mention must also be made of the fact that, like Harkness, she stood for justice and world peace.²⁹ Finally, there is her sincerity and her integrity as a person. Unlike some psychologists and even unlike some philosophers, she lived her philosophy in such a manner that she won the esteem, not only of her students, but also of her most distinguished colleagues.³⁰

With this then, though somewhat reluctantly for fear that we have not done her full justice, we take our leave of America's *most outstanding* feminine thinker. Suffice it to say that, in what follows, we shall make an effort to view the five feminine minds in terms of the perspective involved in all that preceded in this paper.

4. THE FIVE FEMININE THINKERS IN PERSPECTIVE

As we view these five distinguished women—Margaret Fuller, Jane Addams, Edith Hamilton, Georgia Harkness, and Mary Whiton Calkins—in perspective, certain things become clear. The *first* is the fact that they are different. Thus, while Fuller and Hamilton are the most literary, classical, and aesthetic, and while Addams is the most socially minded, Calkins and Harkness are the most philosophically and theologically inclined. The *second* that comes to mind is the fact that, in spite of their differences, they share the following: the concern for values; the predominance of the personal and the concrete over the abstract; and, of course, a common devotion to the rights of women. *Third*, with the exception of Calkins, intuition seems to be predominant over reason and large-scale speculation. The *fourth* is the fact that while it is true that Fuller, at times, showed signs of a certain lack of balance, the other *four* are outstanding as examples of moderation.

Sixth and, finally, all five of them, in their togetherness, as we have already seen, did something that serves as a challenge to the gifted young women of all lands. Let it be repeated that, as pioneers who paved the way, they stand as beacons to guide the most talented and most promising young women of the future. In fact, since women are closer to life and its values than men, both as thinkers and as reformers, they may actually lead us to that great WORLD CIVILIZATION which alone can save us from a nuclear holocaust which threatens to turn this green earth into a flaming hell.

FOOTNOTES

1. On Hutchinson, see Frederick Mayer, *A History of Modern Philosophy* (New York : American Book Co., 1951), pp. 280-281.
2. On Fuller, the following are helpful : Mason Wade, ed., *The Writings of Margaret Fuller* (New York : Viking Press, 1941); and Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought* (New York : Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1927), Vol. II, pp. 426-423.
3. Wade, *op. cit.*, p. 107.
4. For this and other mystical passages, see *Ibid.*, pp. 65-67.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 218.
6. On Addams, the following are illuminating : Anne F. Scott, ed., *Democracy and Social Ethics* (Cambridge : Belknap Press, 1964); and Jane's two books—*Twenty Years at Hull-House* (New York : Macmillan, 1954); and *The Second Twenty Years at Hull-House* (New York : Macmillan, 1930).
7. For her efforts to stop World War I, see her book, *The Second Twenty Years at Hull-House*, pp. 113-152.
8. Scott, *op. cit.*, xlvi-xlvii.
9. *Ibid.*, p. lxxii.
10. *Ibid.*, p. xlvi.
11. (New York : W. W. Norton & Co., 1930).
12. *The Echo of Greece* (New York : W. W. Norton & Co., 1957), p. 21 ; and also *The Greek Way*, p. 31.
13. *The Echo of Greece*, p. 18.
14. In *The Ever-Present Past* (New York : W. W. Norton & Co., 1964), pp. 183-184.
15. On her background and career, see the following : Charles Moritz, ed., *Current Biography Yearbook*, 1960 (New York : H. W. Wilson Co., 1960), pp. 178-180 ; and Tyler Thompson's memorial account, in *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, Vol. XLVIII, 1974-1975, p. 174.

16. (New York : Harper, 1949).
17. (Nashville : Abingdon Press, 1973).
18. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
19. *Foundations of Christian Knowledge*, p. 106.
20. See William Ernest Hocking's very important book: *The Coming Word Civilization* (New York : Harper, 1956).
21. See Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 174.
22. On Calkins' life, see Edward T. James, ed., *Notable American Women* (Cambridge : Belknap Press, 1971), Vol. I, pp. 278-280.
23. (New York : Macmillan, 1925).
24. James, *op. cit.*, p. 278.
25. See her essay in George P. Adams & Wm. P. Montague, eds., *Contemporary American Philosophy* (New York : Macmillan), 1930, Vol. I, pp. 199-200.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
27. For her effort to deal with this problem, see Adams & Montague, *op. cit.*, p. 215. For my efforts to deal with this problem from a more realistic, personalistic perspective, see my two books: *Roy Wood Sellars as Creative Thinker and Critic* (Meerut, India : Sadhna Prakashan, 1972); and *A Synoptic Approach to the Riddle of Existence* (St. Louis : Warren H. Green, Inc., 1977).
28. See especially his *Nature, Mind and Modern Science* (New York : Macmillan, 1954) ; and also for criticisms of irrationalism and the defense of reason Karl Jaspers' *The Future of Mankind* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 209-261.
29. See James, *op. cit.*, p. 279.
30. *Ibid.* and also P. Magg's article, "The Personalism of Mary Whiton Calkins," in *The Personalist*, Vol. XXVIII, Winter, 1974, pp. 52-53.

Immigrant Nationalism and Feminism :
Glos Polek and the Polish Women's
Alliance in America, 1898-1917

THADDEUS C. RADZIAŁOWSKI

It is now commonplace to observe that the history of Slavic immigrants in the U. S. has been more severely neglected than the history of American Blacks. What is usually missed, however, is that such writing as has been done on Slavs in America has concerned itself largely with the experience of men. The experience of Slavic women has been ignored by historians of immigration and students of the history of American women have yet to discover it. Part of the reason for the neglect is the unfounded assumption that little was to be learned from these Slavic Griseldas. Worn down by ceaseless labor and childbearing, they had little time for opinions. Dominated in the home by their husbands and fathers, in public life they were under the sway of priests whom they obeyed with superstitious awe.¹

Such images of Slavic women are far from the reality. Recent studies of women in peasant families and communities have shown that their roles were considerably wider and more complex than is usually credited. In adapting these roles to the demands and conditions of urban life immigrant women, while suffering some initial erosion of traditional positions and prerogatives, opened up for

themselves the possibility of even wider participation in public life than had been previously available.² In this new context, Slavic immigrants created many large and wealthy women's organizations and developed a number of influential Catholic sisterhoods.

From the very beginning, Slavic women were involved in the work and struggles, sometimes violent, which attended the birth of their communities in the New World.³ They played a major role in the church battles and riots which scarred the early history of the Slavic Parish life in America. In unprecedented numbers they joined the religious orders which taught and ministered to their peoples. In the parochial schools, immigrant women and the daughters of immigrants helped to create the ethnic identity and the national feeling which was the cement which bound the new communities together.⁴ As members of a community which saw itself wronged Slavic women rallied beside their men to do battle with police, troops, scabs and company guards during the great strikes in the coalfields, the packinghouses, and the factories.⁵ They showed equal courage when they went out on strike themselves against the low wages and inhuman conditions they found in the sweatshops and textile mills.⁶

One area in which they were particularly successful was the establishment of insurance companies and financial institutions. The First Catholic Slovak Ladies Association, which was founded in Cleveland in 1892 to provide insurance and sororital companionship for Slovak women in America, has grown over the past 85 years to 96,000 members organized in 900 branches. Run entirely by the immigrant women themselves, it had, through careful management and wise investment, accumulated assets of over 45 million dollars by the nineteen seventies. In 1969, the Association absorbed its male counterpart, the Catholic Slovak Brotherhood which had been established in 1912, twenty years after the women had founded their society. Polish women founded their own organization shortly after the founding of Slovak Ladies Association. This organization, *Zwiazek Polek w Ameryce* (ZPA) or Polish Women's Alliance of America, like its Slovak counterpart was created to provide companionship as well as health insurance and death benefits. At present its assets are in excess of thirty millions of dollars and its membership exceeds 90,000.⁷

The Polish Women's Alliance is interesting, however, far beyond any enlightenment its history provides as a case study of the successful management of an insurance and investment operation by Polish immigrant women. Its history and especially its early history prior to the U. S. entrance into World War I affords a fascinating insight into the wellsprings of immigrant feminism and an example of the complex interdependency ideas like feminism and nationalism develop in a particular historical context.

The Polish Women's Alliance was born at a meeting held in April, 1898 in the Chicago home of Stefania Chmielinska. This meeting was followed by a series of others in the spring and summer which culminated in the incorporation of a Polish Women Society with eleven charter members on August 5, 1898. By 1899, three other groups had been created in the Chicago area on the model of the original. After joint meetings three of the four groups agreed to merge into an Association of Polish Women's Groups (*Towarzystwo Związek Polek*). When the Association held its first Congress (*Sejm*) in May, 1900 it was composed of eight groups (six in Chicago, one in Braddock, Pennsylvania, and one in Hartford, Connecticut) and 264 members. At the time of the second *Sejm* in June, 1901 it numbered 16 groups with 506 members. The treasury showed an income of \$625·61 for the year with \$306·04 remaining after the health and death claims were paid. The organization grew to 21 groups in 1902 and 28 groups and 1400 members by June, 1903. It had acquired a charter and incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois in 1902, and it had also established by that time a monthly newspaper *Głos Polek* (Voice of Polish Women) and a special Education Division (*Wydział Oświatowy*). In 1902, the group began the practice of selecting a Polish woman doctor as the official physician of the organization. Dr. Marya Dowiatt was the first to hold that position. At the same 1902 *Sejm* Anna Neumann, a charter member who was to guide the organization during its first decade was elected to her first term as President.⁸

The women who founded and led the ZPA were initially drawn from the very small number of middle class women, many of whom had been educated in Europe, in the Polish immigrant community. Their outlook was shaped to a significant degree by the tradition of "organic work" which replaced romantic revolutionism among the Polish educated classes in the second half of

the nineteenth century after the bloody failure of the 1863-64 insurrection, "organic work" combined nationalism with a strong belief in liberal humanitarianism, progress, education and moral uplift. Its practitioners were committed to spreading literacy and popularizing modern scientific knowledge among the common people. The new Poland, they believed, would be born out of gradual, harmonious, "organic" social, economic intellectual and moral progressive development. More than any other factor, education was to be the engine of progress.⁹

The majority of the women who became members of the organization were, however, from the working class, although more than likely from the most literate and ambitious members of it. Many were doubtlessly attracted to the health and death insurance benefits available to members of the ZPA as to the cultural activities of the organization. *Glos Polek* indirectly gives some indication of the social composition of the membership in its concerns during times of strikes and unemployment. Reporting on strikes of women workers, it frequently noted that members of the organization were among those on the picket lines and during a recession in 1912, the newspaper attempted to raise a levy for the many members who were in need because they or their husbands were out of work.¹⁰

Stefania Laudyn, one of the most talented of *Glos Polek's* editors, clearly saw the organization as a unique fusion of women of the working class and the intelligensia. In an editorial in *Glos Polek* she called for the solidarity of all Polish women:

Let us join hands— women who do hard labor and women of words and thoughts— let us believe in each other, let us respect each other's work ... (Women of) all classes, ranks and conditions (forward) to the clearing of the road to enlightenment and the future! Let us not divide but unite; let us not destroy but shape and create what Polish women want and desire.¹¹

The single most important activity to which the Polish Women's Alliance devoted itself was the education of Polish women and children. This work was carried on in a variety of ways. The group established a reading room for women in Chicago which contained books, newspapers and journals, especially women's magazines from Europe and America. Staffed by

volunteers the library was open two evenings a week for members.¹² Through its Education Division, the Alliance conducted schools in Polish language, history, and culture and conducted summer camps for Polish immigrant children from the cities.¹³ Local branches of the Alliance and individual members who could afford it established schools in homes and meeting halls to teach girls and young women skills such as typing, sewing, and hat making so that they might enhance their chances of finding decent work. These informal schools also helped the young immigrant women to improve their literacy and to learn something about the national history and culture.¹⁴

The ZPA's newspaper, *Glos Polek* (which reappeared as a weekly in 1910 after a seven years hiatus) was its most significant instrument of education and socialization of the immigrants. With a readership that far exceeded its membership (over 23,000 by 1917), the newspaper had an important impact on the women of the growing Polish American community. Its columns were given over to didactic articles on organizing and running a household, cooking, advice to consumers on a variety of matters, on health and how to maintain it and on raising children. The newspaper also ran as part of its regular format features on the lives of famous women especially Polish heroines and writers, signed articles on foreign and domestic affairs and poems, serialized novels and stories as well as a special children's "corner".¹⁵

The history of women, their contemporary struggle for justice and rights in the western world and their problems in other parts of the world were central issues in the news columns, the signed articles and on the editorial pages of *Glos Polek*. The paper ran columns entitled "Women's Chronicle" (*Kronika Kobieca*) dealing with the accomplishments of contemporary women from around the world and "From the Women's Movement" (*Z Ruchu Kobiecego*) which concentrated on news on the struggle for votes, admission to universities, medical schools and law schools and other feminist issues of the day.¹⁶ Side by side with these regular features *Glos Polek* ran special stories on subjects such as the beginnings of a new role for women in Turkey, Persia, and China, on the history of women in medicine especially on the work of Dr. Maria Zakrzewska and on leaders of the battle for political rights such as the Pankhursts and Susan B. Anthony.¹⁷ On the editorial

pages, the editors frequently commented on women's issues and the progress of feminist causes.¹⁸ The immigrant readers of the weekly edition of *Glos Polek* were probably as knowledgable about the problems and activities of contemporary women as any group of people in America. Furthermore, they received the news in a context highly sympathetic to the political and social progress of women and in a newspaper controlled and run entirely by women.

In spite of the commitment to feminist causes and support for women's movements worldwide, the Polish Women's Alliance developed few contacts with feminist organizations and activists in the U. S. There appear to be several reasons for this failure to make common cause with their American sisters. First, they were separated from English speaking women by the barriers of language and culture. Second, the problems of the immigrant community were so massive and compelling that much of the energy of the Polish women had to be directed to their alleviation. Third, their feminism was inextricably tied to a sense of Polish identity and nationalism. This gave their views an unusual perspective which their American sisters could not share nor perhaps even comprehend.

The leadership of the Polish Women's Alliance had a strong sense of themselves as members of both an oppressed sex and an oppressed people. The societies which repressed them as women also tried to crush them as Poles. They had a strong sense of special mission as a saving remnant to preserve a culture that was the object of systematic attempts at obliteration by Germans and Russians.¹⁹ We must "join together, organize" wrote the editor of *Glos Polek* in setting down the goals of the society in 1910, for "we believe profoundly and feel intensely in our Polish souls the command that the Polish woman must so protect the environment in which the souls of her loved ones develop" that they will "always remain faithful to fatherland and people." She goes on:

"For the development of Polish culture in a distant land, for the creation of a new Polish society here for future generations, for this great historical task — it is the obligation of all of us here, in the emigration, children of one beloved land — to join together, strongly, solidly ..." ²⁰

The Alliance tried to inculcate in its members a sense of solidarity not only with Polish women in America but with Polish

women everywhere. In an article entitled "American Women and Polish Women: A Word to Our Young Women", the editor describes the activity of Polish women in the Polish lands and notes that they are in the forefront of the worldwide struggle to save Polish identity. Polish women in the United States must emulate their zeal and commitment if the battle is to be won. The liberation of women for *Glos Polek* was part of the problem of the liberation of the nation. An acceptance of a greater role for women in that struggle and even of a "special mission" was in turn for them itself a milestone in the emancipation of women. The high purpose around which Polish American feminism organized itself was national salvation.²¹

As a result of the commitment to two separate causes the Polish Women's Alliance developed a highly complex almost dialectical position *vis-a-vis* the claims of feminist solidarity and nationalism. The Alliance saw itself on the one hand as an organization that would build bridges between Polish women and women of other nationalities. On the other hand, *Glos Polek* warned Polish women repeatedly not to join women's organizations which drew membership from other ethnic groups or women's associations of other ethnic groups especially Czech or German. Such action would unite them with the Irish or German enemies of their people, subject them to abuse and discrimination and would withdraw their energies from the national struggle at best and could lead to the denationalization of themselves and their children at worst.²²

In dealing with their fellow Poles, however, they often took the position that they as women must retain their independence from all Polish male and male-dominated organizations. The ZPA stated this position—and in process made a clear statement of its feminist principles—in reply to an article in the November 16, 1910 issue of *Dziennik Zwiazkowy*, the organ of the Polish National Alliance, that suggested the Women's Alliance and the National Alliance join together. Organizations which have both men and women members wrote *Glos Polek* "do not today give a free and independent field for work and thought to women" and in them "the shaping and influencing of decision" falls always to men. This happens even when the men with the best will "want to let women participate" because "of the centuries old

arrangements by which men rule and decide and the women always obey." Furthermore,

the centuries old guidance and influence of men over women has rooted itself so strongly not only into the character of men but also of women—and not just un-emancipated women, but even progressive ones—so that today, whenever she finds herself in the presence of male opinion, a woman unconsciously accepts it as right and loses her own independence... So today's women who care about their independence, understand that they can never be free and unhampered except in their own organization, that in only in a women's organization will their ideas, their feelings and wills dominate. Only in such an organization—without the influence and protection of men—can women's thought mature, can their wills be tempered, can they bring forth a faith in their own powers and their own work and activity. (A woman) can feel herself her own person—unassisted by anyone—sometimes can even struggle sharply and fiercely, the beneficiary of no gallantry. Struggle is struggle, life is life (and) in the conflict of interests and appetites the accustomed honied words disappear like billows of soapsuds, and a genuine life with its sharp and hard contents and its truth forces itself to the surface.

The editor of *Glos Polek* acknowledged that at some future time it might be possible for men and women to join in the same organization but that can only happen when "the will to rule disappears from man's soul" and when he can accept a woman as a "truly completed, equal person not as a minor child." This can only happen also when women are willing to take the responsibility for themselves, strengthen and educate themselves and participate more fully in public and civic life. In the meantime, the ZPA sent "its heartfelt greetings to its great, brotherly organization" and pledged itself "to go forth hand in hand together with our brothers into the field of work for the national cause, for the accomplishment of the single, highest of all goals—the building of the Fatherland."²³

The Polish Women's Alliance also developed a very ambiguous attitude toward the Catholic Church. On the one hand, the ZPA appeared to be favorably disposed to the Church. The overwhelm-

ing majority of the members of the Alliance were practicing Catholics; many of the local branches of the organization bore the names of women saints; church halls were often used for meetings and priests were in attendance at all national meetings and many local ones to offer invocations and sometimes to address the body on moral issues. The ZPA publicly acknowledged the Church as the single most important agency in the Polish community and regarded it as crucial to preserving and propagating national identity and moral uplift among the immigrants.²⁴

However, the positivist tradition out of which the intellectual leaders came was strongly tinged by anti-clericalism and Maria Konopnicka, the writer and poet who was almost the intellectual patron saint of the movement during its early years was well known for her espousal of radical populist causes and especially anti-clericalism.²⁵ Some women in the Alliance were openly contemptuous of the pompous parades of uniformed, banner bearing church societies²⁶ and the organization itself did not hold back from criticism or ridicule of the church hierarchy's position on women's issues. For example, in response to an editorial in the *Dziennik Chicagoski*, a newspaper edited by the Resurrectionist which allowed that the "Church has nothing against and certainly Fathers, does not condemn equal rights for women, except that it is necessary that women be mature enough for them." The editors of *Glos Polek* shot back defiantly :

Ha...a people become ready for freedom when they get it, as the negroes grew into it when they were emancipated, as the Chinese matured when they won freedom for themselves. In the area of rights everything must be taken and one must never wait to be given (them) for they will never be given. And so with Woman when she struggles for a right she must win it and take it.²⁷

The question of the relationship of the ZPA to the Church was raised directly just before the National Convention in late spring of 1912. Marya Olszewska-Kryszak of group 103 in Milwaukee wrote to *Glos Polek* complaining that "the organization lacked a soul" and in order to remedy that it should put a reference to Catholicism in its constitution and perhaps affiliate in some way with the Church.²⁸ A sharp and lively debate on the issue was joined and continued in the pages of the newspaper for the

next two months. The attempt to revise the constitution and affiliate as a church organization failed. The arguments of those who opposed the idea, whose letters were a clear majority of those printed on the issue, centered on two main points: first, that the ZPA had a special mission and must remain independent to accomplish it and second, that the organization welcomed women of all faiths and stood for religious toleration.²⁹ A third argument, although advanced only by two of the women was clearly on the minds of some of the other letter writers and probably many of the readers in light of the strong public statement of the organization on joining with the Polish National Alliance one and one half years before: to affiliate as a Catholic organization was to risk domination by a powerful male clergy.³⁰

The Polish Women's Alliance through its newspaper, its Education Division and its resolutions at national conventions took positions on a variety of public issues which clearly aligned it with the general currents of progressivism in the United States prior to World War I. In almost all areas the stands the Alliance took reflected its dual orientation. For example, the ZPA took strong and consistent stands against the liquor interests and urged sobriety on its readers and their families and prohibition on the society. On the one hand it opposed liquor because alcoholism among men led to abuse and neglect of women and children and, of course, this was a serious problem in the immigrant community.³¹ In addition, however, the Alliance also had a specifically nationalist response to the alcoholism problem. In an article entitled "Whiskey and We" (*Wodka i My*) *Glos Polek* saw the issue in terms of national survival. Calling for a return that struggle which all civilized societies which care about their people are waging against alcohol, the editor in an almost desperate tone wrote:

If we do not care about this and in regard to this matter do not exert ourselves we— Poles— who are threatened from every side and about whom no one cares or is in any way concerned, except ourselves, will disappear.³²

The Alliance newspaper followed the same pattern of double opinions in regard to its views of education. Strongly under the influence of Jean Jacques Rousseau, whom they quoted often, the editors of *Glos Polek* argued for summer camps in rural or wilder-

ness areas as necessary for genuine education. Communing with nature, they felt, led to the development of the proper emotional and moral sentiments in the child.³³ In the schools, *Glos Polek* favored a change from the harsh traditional regimen to a more humane system which treated each child as an individual and a thinking rational individual at that. The editors were totally opposed to physical punishment of the children in the schools and at home as well.³⁴

In regard to the education of women the Alliance took a strong feminist position. Women were to receive whatever education they wished and no educational institutions or courses of study should be closed to them. Women were urged especially to study science and mathematics even if they did not make careers in those areas for such knowledge was useful in modern life.³⁵ The editor of *Glos Polek* made a very eloquent case for coeducational institutions in which she summed up the essence of her feminist views :

Yes, women should get higher education. And the same kind of education men get if they wish it and they should go to universities together with males. This would give men the opportunity to acquire the best of feminine characteristics, *i. e.*, humanitarianism in the broadest sense of the word.

Women, on the other hand, attending classes with men and rubbing shoulders with them daily would "lose some of their timidity" and become acquainted with males as equals on a first-hand basis. Such knowledge would serve women in good stead in later life either as wives and mothers or as career women.³⁶

In looking at education from the perspective of Polish immigrants, the women of the Alliance focused on its practical aspects. Poles should keep their children in school as long as possible for in the United States those people without education above the elementary level were doomed to spend their lives in manual labor. If the Poles were to succeed individually and collectively in America, they would have to take advantage of the educational opportunities the country offered. Keeping children in school had other benefits also. It kept them out of the hideous factories and sweatshops that exploited child labor and it provided the possibility of a future educated and professional class of American Poles who would enhance the good name of the group and who

would preserve its culture and identity.³⁷

As Feminists, as representatives of an ethnic group whose members were largely laborers and as persons who believed in a progressive and humane society, the ZPA was often found championing the rights of workers, especially of women and children employed in the mines and mills.³⁸ They reported many of the strikes of women workers and supported them enthusiastically. They deplored the "hunger and want" often facing strikers and condemned the "barbarous abuse" of women and children by the police during strikes.³⁹ The condition of workers and the abuse and exploitation they suffered, especially Polish workers, led *Glos Polek* to a condemnation of the American industrial system and even of the country itself. After a disaster in the spring of 1911, in the Pennsylvania anthracite fields, the paper after denouncing the "indifference of the capitalists", asked rhetorically "How many of our brothers are lost in those gloomy pits, condemned to death by the frightful greed of the exploiters and the indifference of the government."⁴⁰

Earlier the same year *Glos Polek* in a tone of great bitterness noted that Poles brought to this country "their strength, health, youth" that "capital of our land" which "built the well-being and wealth of this nation." In return they received the lowest possible wages, discrimination, lack of rights and dangerous conditions which took their lives and crippled them. The result was "a massive catastrophe in the mines, the factories, on the rails and at the furnaces ... People's lives here are nothing, especially the lives of the immigrants". The reaction of the industrialists to these terrible accidents was "He's gone, there will be others."⁴¹ In 1916, *Glos Polek* concluded sadly that "the lot of the workers is indeed heavy in the famous land of freedom... The economy of this free country sacrifices a greater number of lives than the war in Europe."⁴²

The ZPA did not affiliate with any political party but it watched closely the positions taken by all the parties on women's issues. It probably agreed with the socialists more than with any other party and certainly had more faith in the sincerity of their belief in women's rights. For example, in 1911, Republican progressives introduced a bill in the state legislature to grant minimum pay to women. They argued that the passage of minimum

wage would improve the moral and general situation of women and make them healthier and more contented workers. If draught animals work better when well cared for, people should also, according to one supporter of the measure. *Glos Polek* reacted sharply to this line of argument :

When Republican "progressives" want to do something good for women they do it from business motives and they have pity on women as if they were animals. The socialists support limits on the labor of women, children and men from motives purely humanitarian and from a desire for justice. They believe women ought to receive the same pay if they do the same work that men do.⁴³

The readers of *Glos Polek* were also treated periodically to an expose of the unfavourable stereotypes and the subtler forms of discrimination which resulted from the long subordination of women. It did not hesitate to attack the age old prejudices which men used to justify prostitution and refused to accept as valid images of women as temptresses who inspired lust and lured men to ruin. The terrible curse of venereal disease would only cease its ravages when men were willing to practise the same moral standards that they prescribed for women.⁴⁴ This double standard which was symbolic and symptomatic of the social inferiority of women would only end when women assumed full equality. "The contemporary woman" wrote Dr. Budzinska-Terlecka in the pages of *Glos Polek* "The liberated, awakened woman—a person in the full meaning of that word, does not recognize the double morality, which is lenient for men and absolutely rigorous for women."⁴⁵

The United States' entrance into World War I provides a convenient breaking point in time to bracket the first period of the history of the Polish Women's Alliance. The Russian Revolution and later Wilson's Fourteen Points raised the possibility of the resurrection of Poland after almost a century and a quarter of partition and martyrdom. The attention of the ZPA was diverted to this cause and to war relief to the Polish lands over which the War on the Eastern Front had raged for three years, to the virtual exclusion of all other interests. The cause of the New Poland was so compelling (and the drama so intense) that it preoccupied the Alliance until the early nineteen twenties and until that time its earlier interests such as women's rights, the problems of the

immigrant community, and education received scant attention. The creation of a Polish state—which had been one of the fondest dreams and the most urgent goal of the Alliance before World War I—and the continued existence of an immigrant community forced the ZPA to rethink its relationship to its constituents and to reshape its goals in the 1920's. This marked the beginning of a new chapter in its history which is beyond the limited scope of this article.⁴⁶

In its first two decades of existence the Polish Women's Alliance grew from a handful of women to an organization of almost 24,000 women. An insurance company run entirely by women it provided desperately needed health insurance to immigrant families and death benefits to husbands and orphaned children of its members. The grateful letters of bereaved husbands who received assistance and moral support from the women of the organization as well as an insurance settlement, testify to the effectiveness of the ZPA. As an ethnic organization it helped to socialize Polish immigrant women to the American city. It taught them new ways of cooking, cleaning, childcare, and explained health and hygiene to them. Through its newspaper and its local meetings it urged on its members the wisdom of saving for the future, avoiding needless spending, acquiring training and job skills, shunning gambling and excessive use of alcohol and other traits usually subsumed under the misnamed 'puritan ethic'. As a nationalist organization, it struggled to preserve national language and culture and teach them to immigrants who were denied the right to know them by foreign overlords. Finally, it sought to mobilize their energies to win back the homeland one day. As a Feminist organization, the ZPA educated its largely working class membership to the accomplishments of women in the past and present and to the potentialities of women in a future wherein 'the hitherto stunted soul of woman' was liberated and she took her place in human society as a full human being. Far more willing than their American counterparts to accept and even glory in women's 'traditional' roles as wives and mothers, the women of the Alliance nevertheless battled as fiercely for political rights and full educational and career opportunities for women. They also understood as clearly as any group of women the more subtle but equally debilitating effects of centuries of social and cultural subordination. Finally

as persons committed to social and political progress in general, they spoke out against industrial enslavement and abuse of women and children and they wept for 'their brothers' condemned to early death or maiming in factories and mines. With a faith in the ultimate goodness and rationality of human beings they favored an educational system that treated children as sensitive, thinking persons and led them by example rather than corporal punishment.

The logotype on the first page of every issue of *Glos Polek* showed a handsome young woman crowned with laurel leaves sitting with her extended left hand holding open a large tome and her right hand pointing to a globe beside her. Behind her are a lyre and a palette and brushes. Her head is framed by rays of light on which are written in Polish in order from top to bottom *Faith, Enlightenment, Love of the Native Language, Concord, Perseverance*. This masthead symbol represents well the hopes and aims of the Polish Women's Alliance in America during its early years.

FOOTNOTES

1. For an example of this kind of attitude see Bessie Olga Pehotsky, *The Slavic Immigrant Woman*. (Cincinnati, Ohio : Powell and White, 1925) pp. 30-32, 52, 56, 58.
2. Joan W. Scott and Louise Tilly have recently argued that the separate roles and separate spheres of men's and women's work in the European village "did not imply discrimination or hierarchy. It appears, on the contrary, that neither sphere was subordinated to the other." Men and women were equally members of the family work unit and while the husband was the head of the household his wife often controlled the finances and made many of the crucial decisions for the family. This pattern was carried over initially to urban life and survived in one adaption or another well into the 20th Century in both Europe and America. See J. W. Scott and Louise Tilly "Women's Work and the Family in Nineteenth Century Europe", Charles Rosenberg (ed) in *The Family in History*, (Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975) pp. 145-178. It can be argued that the decline of the sense of the family as a unit and the gradual change of familial values into individualistic ones caused unfavorable alteration in the status of the woman who remained home as wife and mother and thus did not earn her "own" wages. In the city she was also outside much of the traditional framework of sanction and respect that was part of the complex of variables on which status was based in the village. For example, Oscar Handlin has suggested that in the New World a woman's status was

based to a significant degree on the occupation and position of her husband over which she had little control and to which she could add little. Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted*, Second Edition Enlarged (N. Y.: Little Brown, 1973) p. 211. Ms. Pehotsky notes that the lack of knowledge of English and less opportunity to learn it than her husband or children reduced the woman's status. Pehotsky, pp. 39-40.

3. In assessing the development of any immigrant institution one must bear in mind the fact that although a majority of its members were of peasant origin, the immigrant community was quite heterogeneous. Polish settlements, for example, by the twentieth century contained intellectuals with European educations, persons educated in the U.S., priests, nuns, European trained artisans, skilled workers who learned their trades in the U. S., semi-skilled and unskilled workers. It was also composed of Silesians, Kashubs and Slovincians from the Baltic Coast, Gorals from the Mountains as well as persons who in addition to other local or provincial identities were also identified with the three partition areas. One limited sample also indicates that a significant minority of Polish immigrants had been urban workers and had some ties with the Socialist party in Europe. See Peter Friedenberg, *The Emergence of a U. A. W. Local 1936-1939* (Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1976) pp. 3, 27, 100. A significant but undetermined number of immigrants were the descendants of the rural petty gentry which had been disenfranchised at the beginning of the 19th Century. Although in many ways undistinguishable from the peasant mass into which they had sunk, these people often had a greater sense of national identity and of social mobility coupled with residual feelings of deprivation about their loss of status. It was from this group that the leaders of the working class movement in Polish cities sprang. Recent studies have estimated that the gentry made up about one quarter of the Polish speaking population of the old Polish Lands. See Aleksander Gella, "The Life and Death of the Old Polish Intelligentsia," *Slavic Review* Vol. 30, No. 1 (March, 1971) p. 8. Finally, the population contained a number of Polish Socialists, Polish Protestants, and culturally assimilated Jews who identified themselves as Poles.

Once the immigrants arrived in America they were faced with the unfamiliar task of creating a new community often in conjunction with people whose social, occupational or geographical background was very different from theirs. The need for overcoming this difference was itself sometimes a reason for the creation of institutions. Thus, the immigrant communities and their institutions were created and defined themselves in the U. S. partially as a result of the complex interaction, conflict and accommodation of the various elements of the immigrant population with each other. This is true of the *Zwiazek Polek w Ameryce* with which I will be concerned in this paper. While a detailed social analysis of the organization is beyond the scope of my work at this point, I will note in passing the composition of the organization because this is important to understanding the thrust of the group.

4. In Detroit, in 1907, two-thirds of all of the persons in the Polish com-

munity who held professional and semi-professional status were teaching nuns. See Peter A. Ostafin, "The Polish Peasant in Transition : A Study of Group Integration as a Function of Symbioses and Common Definition" Diss. University of Michigan, 1948, p. 83. On the role of the largest and most influential of all of the Slavic teaching orders see my article "Reflections on the History of the Felicians," *Polish American Studies*, vol. XXXII No. 1 (Spring, 1975). pp. 19-28.

5. During a strike in the Pennsylvanian coal fields "Big Mary" Septek leading a band of women and young boys waged guerrilla war against strikebreakers and troops sent in to protect them. Victor Greene, *The Slavic Community on Strike*. (South Bend : Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1965) pp. 143-144. During the riots which accompanied the great Packing house strike of 1921-22, the ferocity of the attacks by Polish women of strikebreakers and police astounded the press. Almost half of those arrested in the disturbances were women and they took about half the casualties among the strikers. About 40 per cent of the Strike Relief Committee were women. See *Dziennik Chicagoski*, December 8, 1921, December 9, 1921, December 10, 1921, December 11, 1921.
6. The famous Lawrence Strike of 1912 was begun when Polish women weavers refused to accept the Company's reduction in their pay. Samuel Yellen, *American Labor Struggles* (New York : Monad Press, 1974) p. 176.
7. Lubomyr Wynar, *Encylopedic Dictionary of Ethnic Organizations in the U. S.* (Littleton, Colorado : Libraries Unlimited, 1975) pp. 291, 325. The original name of the organization was the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union. It is an interesting commentary on the neglect suffered by Slavic women that when a "Woman's Bank" was founded in New York City recently and capitalized at a mere three million dollars it received widespread publicity. The success of Slavic immigrant women and their descendants in managing their own financial institutions over a long period of time has been largely ignored. The Polish and Slovak women's groups have capital assets over ten times that of the newly founded Woman's Bank. On the Woman's Bank see *New York Times*, October 17, 1975.
8. *Glos Polek* June, 1903. *Glos Polek* which is the most important source on the early history of the organization was published as a monthly from May, 1902 to June, 1903 at which time it ceased publication. It resumed publication as a weekly on Thursday, November 3, 1910.
9. Stefan Kieniewicz *Historia Polski 1795-1918* (Warsaw State Scientific Publishers, 1968) pp. 317-319. O. Halecki *A History of Poland*. (New York : Roy Publishers, 1943,) pp. 254-260.
10. See for example *Glos Polek* July 4, 1912.
11. *Glos Polek*, November 3, 1910.
12. *Glos Polek*, March, 1917.
13. *Glos Polek*, March 12, 1912 and April 11, 1912.
14. The Editors of *Glos Polek* lauded the founders of these spontaneous informal schools and urged all other branches to consider sponsoring similar classes. *Glos Polek*, January 25, 1912.

15. See for example the "Letter to Polish Children in America by the Editor of *Glos Polek*" November 3, 1910. See also Articles on the Polish writer Marya Konopnicka, January 7, 1912; on Henry James, November 17, 1910; on the famous 18th Century Polish educator Hugo Kollataj, March 7, 1912 and one on women's health, November 10, 1912. The author of the last mentioned article, Dr. J. Budzinska-Terlecka, affirmed in the conclusion to her survey of the health of men and women that physically and morally women are superior to men. In her mind the "woman question" was really the "*masculine question*", a "question of the moral and physical regeneration of men, in which the contemporary woman *should* and *must* play a dominant role," (emphasis in original). On the readership of *Glos Polek* beyond the membership see *Glos Polek*, August 8, 1912.
16. *Glos Polek*, May, 1903, November 3, 1910.
17. *Glos Polek*, May, 1903, June, 1903, July 4, 1912. Dr. Maria Zakrzewska migrated to the U. S. in 1853. She was one of the founders of the first Infirmary for Women and Children in New York City and later established and directed for forty years the New England Hospital for Women and Children. She taught obstetrics and gynecology at the New England Female Medical College, helped set up the first nursing school in the U. S. and led the fight for urban playgrounds. For the latter activity she became known as the "Mother of the Playgrounds Movement". She was also active in the battle against slavery and for women's rights. The first Black trained nurse graduated from her school and Dr. Letitia Still, the first Black woman physician in America interned at her hospital. On Dr. Zakrzewska see S. M. Liguori C. S. F. N. "Marie Elizabeth Zakrzewske: Physician" *Polish American Studies*, IX (January-June, 1952) pp. 1-10 and Joseph Wytrwal *Poles in American History and Tradition*. (Detroit: Endurance Press, 1969) pp. 127-129.
18. See for example, the Editor's comment on the tactics of the Women's Political and Social Union in England and on the new spirit that women can bring to politics. *Glos Polek*, March 14, 1912.
19. At the end of the 19th Century and the beginning of the 20th the German and Russian governments waged a relentless campaign against Polish culture and identity. In German Poland there were even systematic attempts to uproot the Poles from their own land and settle in German colonies. This was an issue to which *Glos Polek* devoted considerable attention. See for example, the story and poignant picture of a Polish family driven off their land by German officials in May, 1903 issue. On German colonization see: Richard W. Tims, *Germanizing Prussian Poland: The H-K-T Society and the Struggle for the Eastern Marches in the German Empire 1849-1919*. (New York, AMS Press, 1966). The Poles, especially Polish women, ran private schools for Polish children to preserve their language and culture. At various times such instruction was illegal. Bonifacy Majchrowicz, a watchmaker, fled from Poznan just ahead of the police in 1903 to escape arrest for running a secret school. His son Thaddeus Machrowicz had a distinguished career as U. S. Congressman and Federal Judge. See Marek Swiecicki and Roza Nowotarska, *The Gentleman from Michigan* (London: Polish

Cultural Foundation, 1974) pp. 10-15. One of the best accounts in English of a session of a secret school is in Eve Curie's biography of her mother, Marie Skłodowska-Curie. *Madame Curie*. Translated by Vincent Sheean. (New York : Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1938) pp. 17-22. Because of her brilliance and her excellent command of Russian, Marie Skłodowska was, to her shame, often chosen to answer the questions so humiliating to a patriotic Polish child put by visiting Russian school inspectors. During this same period the University of Warsaw was converted to a Russian university with all instruction and publications in that language.

20. *Glos Polek*, November 3, 1910.
21. *Glos Polek*, December 1, 1910. The leisure life of American women was denounced and rejected as unworthy of emulation by Polish American women. American women, *Glos Polek* found devoted themselves to vain pursuits and mindless enjoyments such as magazines, card games, parlor games, jewels, clothes, etc., and thus accomplished nothing worthwhile. "That empty life is a reflection of an empty soul," *Glos Polek* concluded.
22. *Glos Polek*, June, 1903. The editor notes that the women's organizations Polish women were likely to join were either national ones or Catholic groups which were likely to be dominated by Irish or German women. She cites a case in which the Irish women who dominated the group "referred contemptuously to the Polish women as d... f... Polacks". Although the editor opposed joining Czech organizations, she viewed the Czech women more favorably and even urged Polish women to emulate them in their thrift and devotion to their organization.
23. *Glos Polek*, November 24, 1910.
24. *Glos Polek*, May 16, 1912; On importance of religious training *Glos Polek*, November 17, 1910.
25. *Glos Polek*, June, 1903; November 3, 1910; November 10, 1910; January 4, 1912. Konopnicka had more articles about her and her works in *Glos Polek* and more of her work was printed in it than any other Polish writer. The Education Division regularly put on programs on her namesday and sent her congratulations until her death in 1910. Maria Konopnicka was born the daughter of a small town lawyer in 1842. She married a country squire while quite young, bore six children and then rebelled, left the manor, and moved to Warsaw. She educated herself on the works of Montaigne, John Stuart Mill, Buckle and the Polish Positivist writers. Her stories and poems dealt with lower class life and were considered very radical and violently anti-clerical. Her best poems reflect the laments of peasant folk songs. She became the symbol of the emancipated woman to young women at the end of the 19th Century. See Czeslaw Milosz, *The History of Polish Literature* (New York : Macmillan, 1969) pp. 318-320.
26. *Glos Polek*, May 30, 1912. Some priests in the Polish community were hostile to the Polish Women's Alliance and an occasional pastor would not allow the group to march in a body or place its flag on the coffin at the funerals of members. See *Glos Polek*, July 4, 1912.
27. *Glos Polek*, April 11, 1912.

28. *Glos Polek*, May 16, 1912.
29. *Glos Polek*, May 30, 1912, June 27, 1912.
30. *Glos Polek*, July 4, 1912.
31. See for example *Glos Polek*, March 7, 1912, July 11, 1912.
32. *Glos Polek*, April 11, 1911.
33. *Glos Polek*, March 21, 1912.
34. *Glos Polek*, February 1, 1912.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Glos Polek*, February, 1903.
37. The ZPA was especially concerned with the problem of juvenile delinquency which was one of the major problems facing the struggling immigrant community (Poles had the highest number of juvenile offenders and children who were wards of the court of any ethnic group in Chicago). They looked to more and better education as a solution as well as to an improved and more cultured home life. *Glos Polek*, November 17, 1910. *Glos Polek* through the years prior to World War I made repeated pleas to parents to keep their children in school and out of the factories even if it meant sacrificing immediate income. *Glos Polek*, July 6, 1911.
38. See *Glos Polek*, January 25, 1912, June 1, 1916.
39. *Glos Polek*, March 7, 1912. These statements are from the paper's comments on the Lawrence Strike of textile workers, many of whom were Poles.
40. *Glos Polek*, May 4, 1911.
41. *Glos Polek*, January 12, 1911,
42. *Glos Polek*, June 1, 1916. While the complaint may have been exaggerated, industrial accidents crippled 7 million and killed 66,000 in 1915 according to government statistics quoted in the article. Brody notes that in the famous South Works of Illinois Steel between 1906 and 1910 almost one quarter of the recent immigrants—each year—3,273 in the five years—were injured or killed. The majority of these were Poles. In one year, 127 East Europeans died in the mills of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. David Brody, *Steelworkers in America* (New York : Harper and Row, 1969) pp. 100-101.

The ZPA was, of course, not alone in the Polish Community in its support of the workers. The editor of fraternal newspaper *Dziennik Zjednoczenia*, wrote in 1922, for example,

The Poles in the United States constitute a working class. We have few capitalists among us ... it is no wonder that the sympathies of the entire Polish society ... are on the side of the worker. (*Dziennik Zjednoczenia*, July 24, 1922).

Sometimes the support of workers was combined with feminist sentiments. For example, in April, 1917, Magdalena Milewska, a Director of the largest Polish American organization in the U. S., the Polish National Alliance, addressing a dressmakers strike meeting in Milwaukee said :

The average woman ... does not realize that every time she puts on a silk dress to go to a ball, she is putting on the shroud of a sister woman who is unable to eke out a mere existence at this work. Your battle is just.

It is the protest of women against abuse. It should meet with the support of all Polish organizations, and the Polish Press ... Your victory will be a woman's victory ... (*Dziennik Zwiaskowy*, April 11, 1917.)

43. *Glos Polek*, May 4, 1911.
44. *Glos Polek*, February 29, 1912, March 7, 1912. This reference is to a two part article entitled "The Road to Freedom : (*Droga do Wolnosci*).
45. *Glos Polek*, November 10, 1910.
46. For an analysis of the impact of these events on the leadership of the Polish American community including the ZPA see, Thaddeus C. Radzialowski, "The competition for Jobs and Racial Stereotypes : Poles and Blacks in Chicago." *Polish American Studies*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2 (Autumn, 1976) pp. 5-18.

Success Through Moderation : The Development of Higher Education for Women in Nineteenth Century Russia

PAUL W. JOHNSON

The history of western societies during the nineteenth century consisted in large part of recurring conflicts between traditional institutions and liberal forces unleashed by the democratic revolutions in America and France. An exceptionally varied and complex array of reform movements called into question the validity of all prevailing notions, as each disputed issue spilled over into another. It was this sort of surging reformism which first brought attention to the matter of full rights for women in the English-speaking nations during the 1830s and 1840s. From its very inception, the women's movement was an idealistic and high-minded affair, so that the desire for higher learning constituted one of its more characteristic features. The 'woman question' soon became a celebrated issue on the Continent, eventually penetrating into the Russian Empire during the 1850s.

Most foreign observers viewed Russia as the most backward nation in Europe : the manifestly reactionary government of Tsar Nicholas I (1825-1855) endeavored to bar progressive influences from the country and severely limit changes in the traditional patterns of Russian life. Russia's humiliating defeat in the Crimean War (1854-56) destroyed her reputation as a

military power and underscored the inevitable consequences of underdevelopment. Faced with the clear necessity of implementing reform, the new emperor, Alexander II (1855-1881), permitted a significant relaxation of censorship laws. A period of comparatively free debate gave way to a decade—known to historians as the Era of Great Reforms—that witnessed the abolition of serfdom, the institution of local self-government, and the introduction of a modern judiciary system. Alexander II also removed numerous restrictions on institutions of higher learning, particularly limits on enrolments imposed during the reign of Nicholas I, and students from every social class and region flooded into the higher schools.¹

The liberalization of Russian society which followed the accession of Alexander II, the Tsar-Liberator, to the throne aroused expectations among the intelligentsia for an improvement in the legal status of women. In his justly famous essay on "The Problems of Life," Nikolai I. Pirogov, renowned humanitarian and surgeon, emphasized the importance of providing Russian woman with a serious education.² Pirogov succeeded in attracting considerable attention to the woman question in general; by the late 1850s, women had formed the first feminist groups in Russia—most notably the Trubnikova circle—and their own journal—*Dawn (Razvets)*. During the fall semester of 1859, Natalia Korsini began attending Professor Konstantin D. Kavelin's lectures on the history of Russian jurisprudence at St. Petersburg University; many other women soon appeared as auditors in higher schools throughout the Empire. Although the greater part of society undoubtedly viewed their presence in the universities and institutes with considerable misgivings, fellow students and, more importantly, numerous professors accepted them. There clearly existed a strong desire for advanced education among girls from the gentry and bureaucratic classes. True, the number of female auditors in the universities was relatively small; but this was largely a reflection of inadequate secondary preparation—not the unreasoning hostility of governmental officials.³

The question of whether to enroll women on an equal standing with men was taken up by the Ministry of Public Education, as it undertook the preparation of a new statute for the univer-

sities. The initial draft provided for the enrollment of women as auditors; however, an outbreak of serious student disorders in the universities during 1861 led to a reconsideration of student rights, including the admission of women to lectures. When queried on the matter, the university councils all acknowledged the desirability of making higher learning available to women; still, those at Moscow and Dorpat expressed their reservations on the issue of coeducation. By a vote of 23 to 2, professors at Moscow University decidedly endorsed the argument that the presence of women in the universities would have a harmful and disruptive influence on the scholarly activities of the young men.⁴ When the new university statute was signed into law by Alexander II on June 18, 1863, it expressly prohibited the admission of women.⁵

The deliberations which surrounded the enactment of new university regulations certainly held forth the implication that separate higher courses would soon be provided for women: yet the government did not immediately proceed with the development of such facilities. Internal disturbances—most notably the Polish rebellion in 1863 and the attempt on Alexander II's life by a university student in 1866—resulted in the dismissal of the liberal minister of public education, Aleksander Golovnin. His successor, Count Dmitri A. Tolstoy, was an unusually methodical and pragmatic administrator. Before any significant expansion of higher education could occur, he considered it necessary to improve and enlarge substantially the number of secondary institutions—including those for girls. The Ministry of Public Education therefore dedicated itself to the framing of new general regulations for the girls' gymnasium (May 24, 1870), the boys' gymnasium (July 31, 1871), and the realschule (May 15, 1872). Gradually, the number of girls in preparatory schools increased, from 22,653 in 1873 to 52,140 in 1883.⁶ The tsarist government had long pursued a severely practical approach to education: its schools were consciously designed to meet specific administrative, economic, or military needs of Russian society. Thus, the reformed seven-year girls' gymnasium qualified its graduates as teachers in primary schools and, with the successful completion of an optional eighth year of study, the lower classes of the gymnasium. Employment opportunities for women were officially defined in 1871, when Alexander II authorized them to serve as teachers,

clerks, telegraphists, feldshers, and druggists.⁷

Meanwhile, numerous women refused to accept the government's decision on the matter of coeducation and continued their efforts to gain access to the universities. With the assistance of professors sympathetic to their cause, a few succeeded in obtaining entry to university lectures; they failed, however, to secure advanced instruction on a systematic basis. The movement on behalf of coeducation at last came to a dead end in 1870, when Count Tolstoy rejected a petition with 213 signatures which called for the enrolment of women at Kharkov University.⁸ Few alternatives remained for those girls wishing to continue their studies on the university level. The more radical feminists—many of whom were, in fact, nihilists—abandoned Russia in search of a higher education. Yet, even in western Europe their opportunities were limited: only the University of Zurich, which in 1857 had enrolled a twenty-four year old Russian woman, N. P. Suslova, permitted women to attend lectures on the same footing as men. By the spring of 1873, some 108 Russian women were studying in Zurich, the majority of them specializing in medicine and the sciences.⁹

The moderate feminists generally preferred to labor in Russia, presenting their case before various academic and governmental officials. As the government had clearly rejected the idea of coeducation—not an especially reactionary view, considering the age—they focussed their energies on obtaining a separate women's university. The leading figure in this movement was a prominent journalist, Evgeniia I. Konradi. In January 1868, she petitioned a congress of naturalists meeting in St. Petersburg, seeking their support on behalf of higher courses for women. Konradi's address, which won the sympathy if not the endorsement of the gathering, defended the proposal on the grounds that, as future mothers, women must be adequately prepared to undertake the early education of Russia's children—her future leaders. A lively public debate of the question followed; and in May, the rector of St. Petersburg University was presented two petitions—bearing the signatures of 396 women—which requested permission to utilize the facilities of his institution in the evenings for higher women's courses. The petitions were forwarded to Count Tolstoy, who received a small delegation representing the feminists and

their supporters among the faculty of the university in November.¹⁰

Tolstoy, himself an established scholar, did not on principle oppose the idea of providing women with higher education; at that time, however, his Ministry lacked the funds necessary for another university. Perhaps more than any other factor, it was the economic backwardness and poverty of imperial Russia which retarded the development of female education and the school system in general during the second half of the nineteenth century. With an annual budget of less than nine million rubles,¹¹ the Minister had to concentrate his efforts on the primary and secondary levels of instruction, in an attempt to create some semblance of rationality and balance in the overall educational system. He reckoned that it would require some 60,000 rubles to start up a women's university of a quality similar to those already in existence. This sum was not available for a project which was—practically speaking—unmistakably of secondary importance. Nevertheless, after consulting with other high officials, he proposed an alternative: public lectures, open to women and men alike, on subjects in the historical-philological curriculum. Such lectures could be arranged with a minimum of expenditure by the Ministry of Public Education.

The debate over whether to accept this compromise plan produced a sharp division among the feminists and their sympathizers. A number of the more radical women wished to reject Tolstoy's proposal, as it fell short of the full program of instruction in the natural sciences, which they much preferred. Most of the women, however, heeded the advice of their male advisers and supporters; they chose instead to accept the scheme for public lectures, with the expectation that these would eventually develop into university courses. Moreover, they perceived that it was most important at this point not to overly antagonize the Minister, who was in a position to block any further progress for female education. Thus, on January 20, 1870 the public lectures commenced—meeting in offices of the Ministry of Public Education—and constituted an immediate and resounding success. The first lectures attracted 767 women and some 150 men.¹² By standards of the women's movement in other European nations, Russian women were indeed achieving meaningful results in their campaign for expanded educational opportunities. In a glowing

letter addressed to the small group of Russian feminists, the outstanding spokesman for the women's cause in England, John Stuart Mill, hailed their attainment as "proof that civilization relatively recent sometimes accepts before the older civilizations great ideas of amelioration."¹³

The next major advance was not long in following: and it came at Moscow University, where only a decade before the professors of the University Council had resolutely balloted against the provision of university schooling for women. In 1871, several professors offered to provide regular university courses for women. After examining the problems involved in financing and providing space for such classes, Count Tolstoy issued a circular on May 6, 1872, in which he authorized the establishment of university courses for women in the evenings at a local gymnasium. Organized on a private basis and under the direction of Professor V. I. Ger'e, the courses opened on November 1, 1872, with an initial enrollment of 58 women. The Ministry of Public Education soon received applications from professors in other university towns, including St. Petersburg, who likewise desired to sponsor higher courses for women. Although the feminists and their active supporters constituted well under one per cent of the urban population, it appeared to Count Tolstoy that sufficient interest existed to justify the preparation of a general statute on university courses for women.

Other, perhaps more compelling, reasons also seemed to point up the importance of expanding the higher courses. Disturbing reports had reached the government from Zurich, to the effect that the more impressionable girls enrolled there had fallen under the influence of Russian emigres and had abandoned "scientific pursuits ... for fruitless political agitation."¹⁴ The problem was discussed in 1872 by a special commission of representatives from the Ministry of Public Education, Ministry of Interior, and the Third Section. There existed an obvious need for a general law analogous to the University Statute of 1863, in order that the development of higher courses might proceed on a sound pedagogical basis and provide girls with an acceptable alternative to foreign schooling.

On May 22, 1873, Alexander II decreed that girls who remained in the schools at Zurich after January 1, 1874 would

the girls. Of 717 students enrolled in the St. Petersburg courses in 1885, for example, 519 were found to be non-residents of the city who usually lived in private apartments. The commission discovered, moreover, that the district curator in fact exercised very little control over the contents of courses of instruction. Delianov himself presided over another commission, which deliberated these findings and at last placed two recommendations for action before Alexander III. The Delianov commission proposed that a revised and much more detailed general statute, similar to the one adopted for the universities in 1884,²² be prepared for the higher courses. Such a law would remove responsibility for the nature and content of courses from the professors and place it directly under Ministry officials. Furthermore, Delianov recommended that, while a new statute was under consideration, the government should suspend new enrollments in the courses, so as to prevent the continued crowding of girls into the cities who "wrongly understood their freedoms".²³ The Emperor agreed that it was "necessary to give these courses a firm and correct foundation" and suspended further admissions on May 12, 1886.

The Delianov commission also proposed a shift in emphasis from the girls' gymnasium to vocational schools, pointing out that the rapid expansion of preparatory schools during the 1870s had resulted "in the education of young girls who, on coming out of secondary educational institutions, aspire for distinction in the higher women's courses."²⁴ Delianov's recommendation for the expansion of girls' vocational schools reflected his philosophical preference for professional education;²⁵ while he was successful in establishing a comprehensive network of trade schools for boys, this proposal was never acted upon. During Alexander III's reign, the number of girls studying in gymnasiums substantially increased, from 46,760 to 71,181, and governmental expenditures on these schools increased by 30%.²⁶

The growing number of graduates from girls' gymnasiums brought pressure on the government to expand the opportunity for further study at a time when the higher courses were contracting. As a result of the 1886 ruling which suspended new admissions, the higher courses for women had collapsed, except for the institution in St. Petersburg. It appeared that these too would soon be forced to close, unless the Ministry lifted its ban on

enrollments. In January, 1889, the wife of a prominent governmental official, Mrs. E. O. Likhacheva, petitioned the Emperor for permission to repeal the proscription. Alexander III permitted Delianov to draw up new regulations for the courses and reopen admissions. The government's position had moderated somewhat because of important changes in the leadership. Count Tolstoy died in 1889 and Pobedonostsev had lost much of his earlier influence over his former student, Alexander III.²⁷ The Ministry of Finance, moreover, was pursuing a thoroughly pragmatic line on education under its new leaders, A. I. Vyshnegradsky and S. Iu. Witte. Women clearly had an important role to play in the overall context of economic modernization, particularly in medicine and education. Thus, new regulations were issued on June 25, 1889.²⁸ Professors lost their controlling influence over the courses and students were expected to reside either with their parents and relatives, or in government-sponsored dormitories. At first, the total number of students hearing lectures was limited to 400; but after 1891, this low number was routinely revised upward, so that by 1895 the total had reached 695.²⁹ In that year, Delianov finally obtained permission to establish a Women's Medical Institute in St. Petersburg. Higher courses soon reopened in Kiev and Odessa: by 1905 the number of students enrolled in the St. Petersburg courses and the Medical Institute was 1,516 and 1,525, respectively.³⁰

By the turn of the century the movement for women's higher education had regained its momentum, and enrollments expanded rapidly. An official history of educational policy during Alexander III's reign, which was published in 1901, stated that the aspiration of Russian women to higher learning was 'clearly valid'.³¹ The significant accomplishments of the previous four decades had been achieved largely through the cooperation of moderate feminists, sympathetic professors, and the government. The social base of the movement was quite limited: it was a phenomenon of the urban middle and upper classes. There were few representatives of other social classes among the feminists, fewer still among the students in the higher courses. Although some governmental officials—often the most powerful ones—had opposed the establishment of higher courses, most probably supported the notion. This was reflected in enrollments at St. Petersburg, the center of bureaucratic Russia, where the

majority of students—374 of 695 in 1895—were the daughters of civil servants.³² Radical feminists, far from contributing to the development of higher education for women, actually hindered the process by their unrestrained behavior, which had permitted conservative elements in the government to justify their opposition to the courses and check their growth in the mid-1880s.

FOOTNOTE

1. On the history of Russian educational policy before 1917, see Patrick L. Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford, 1969); Nicholas A. Hans, *History of Russian Educational Policy, 1700-1917* (New York, 1931); William H. E. Johnson, *Russia's Educational Heritage* (Pittsburgh, 1950); S. V. Rozhdestvensky, *Istoricheskii obzor deiatel'nosti Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniya, 1801-1902 gg.* (St. Petersburg, 1902). All dates in this paper are rendered in the Old Style, which was twelve days behind the western calendar in the nineteenth century.
2. N. I. Pirogov, "Voprosy zhizni," *Izbrannye pedagogicheskie sochineniya* (Moscow, 1953), pp. 69-72. "M. L. Mikhailov and the Emergence of the Woman Question," *Canadian Slavic Studies*, III (1969), 178-99. For the history of female education in Russia, see L. D. Filippova, "Iz istorii zhenskago obrazovaniia v Rossii," *Voprosy istorii* (February, 1963), pp. 209-18; A. E. Ivanov, "Za pravo byt studentka," *Voprosy istorii* (January, 1973), pp. 206-10; E. O. Likhacheva, *Materialy dlia istorii zhenskago obrazovaniia v Rossii* (St. Petersburg, 1901); Sophie Satina, *Obrazovanie zhenshchin v dorevolutsionnoi Rossii* (New York, 1966); A. Sheremetevskaya, "Stranitsa iz istorii vysshago zhenskago obrazovaniia," *Istoričeskii vestnik*, VII (1896), 171-84; K. Shokhol, "K voprosu o vysshago zhenskago obrazovaniia v Rossi," *Zhurnal ministerstwa narodnago prosveshcheniya (ZhMNP)*, XL (August, 1912), 153-95; XLIV (March, 1913), 1-36; A. V. Tyrkova, *Anna Pavlovna Filosofova i eia vremia* (Petrograd, 1915).
3. In 1865 there were only 120 preparatory schools of all types under the Ministry of Public Education; their enrollment totalled 2,129 pupils. Hans, *History*, p. 235. On Dawn, see D. Semenova, "Razsvet: zhurnal nauk, iskusstv—literary dlia vzroslykh u devits, isdavaemy i pod redaktsieiu V. Krempina," *ZhMNP*, CXIII (February, 1862), 23-43. On the female students, see L. F. Pantaleev, *Iz vospominanii proshlogo* (St. Petersburg, 1905), pp. 133-36.
4. Tyrkova, *Filosofova*, I, 172.
5. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii*, series 2, XXXVIII, 621-38. For the debate on the enrollment of women, see Ministerstvo narodnago prosveshcheniya, *Zamechaniia na proekt obshchago ustava Imperatorskikh Rossiiskikh Universitetov* (St. Petersburg, 1862), Part II.
6. N. A. Konstantinov, *Ocherki po istorii srednei shkoly: gimnazii i real 'nye uchilishcha s kontseia XIX do fevral'skoi revolutsii 1917 g.* (Moscow, 1956).

- p. 30. For the law on girls gymnasiums, see "Po proekti polozheniiia o zhenskikh gimnaziia i progimnaziia Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniiia," *ZhMNP*, CXLIX (June, 1870), 61-70. Russian intellectuals, who favored a narrowly scientific education, were hostile to Tolstoy largely because of his emphasis on the humanities; they usually overlooked his positive achievements. See Allen Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoi* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973); James C. Mills, "Dmitrii Tolstoi as Minister of Education in Russia, 1865-1880," Ph. D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.
7. *Polnoe sobranie*, series 2, XLVI, 36-37.
 8. "Po povodi zhenskago adresa, podannago g. ministri narodnago prosveshcheniiia v Kharkove," *ZhMNP*, CLI (October, 1870), 269-74.
 9. J. M. Meijer, *Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zurich* (Assen, 1955). On the interconnection of education and radicalism, see Alain Besancon, *Education et societe en Russie dans le second tiers du XIXe siecle* (Paris, 1974); Daniel R. Brower, *Training the Nihilists: Education and Radicalism in Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca, 1975); P. S. Tkachenko, *Moskovskoe studenchesstvo v obshchestvenno-politicheskoi zhizni Rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX veka* (Moscow, 1958).
 10. Likhacheva, *Materialy*, pp. 494-500; Tyrkova, *Filosofova*, pp. 180-81.
 11. Rozhdestvensky, *Istoricheskii obzor*, p. 734.
 12. Hans, *History*, p. 129.
 13. Francis E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds., *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill* (Toronto, 1972), p. 1528. In 1869, Mill published his justly famous essay "On the Subjugation of Women"; see *Essays on Sex Equality* (Chicago, 1970), pp. 125-242.
 14. Meijer, *Knowledge*, p. 140.
 15. Ministerstvo narodnago prosveshcheniiia, *Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnago prosveshcheniiia*, VII, cols. 944-47.
 16. See E. P. Fedosova, "Bestuzhevskie kursy," *Voprosy istorii* (November, 1975), 216-20; S. N. Valka, et al, *Sankt-Peterburgskie vysshie zhenskie (Bestuzhevskie) kursy, 1878-1918: Sbornik statei*, 2d ed (Leningrad, 1973).
 17. See K. Shokhol, "Vysshee zhenskoe meditsinskoe obrazovanie v Rossii," *ZhMNP*, XXXVII (February, 1912), 172-207.
 18. On the split in the feminist movement, see Robert H. McNeal, "Women in the Russian Revolutionary Movement," *Journal of Social History*, V (Winter, 1971-1972), 143-63; Richard Stites, "Women's Liberation Movements in Russia, 1900-1930," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, VII (1973), 460-74. Foreigners were much impressed with the progress of higher education for women in Russia. Francis G. French, for example, observed that it had been "carried to a higher point than in other countries, the United States excepted." *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1890-1891*, I (Washington, 1894), 219.
 19. Julius W. A. Von Eckardt, *Russia Before and After the War* (London, 1880), p. 244.

20. Rozhdestvensky, *Istoricheskii obzor*, p. 629. On Delianov, see Paul W. Johnson, "Taming Student Radicalism: The Educational Policy of I. D. Delianov," *The Russian Review*, XXXIII (July, 1974), 259-68.
21. Robert F. Byrnes, *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought* (Bloomington, 1968), p. 248; A. A. Polovtsov, *Dnevnik* (Moscow, 1966), II, 418.
22. The 1884 statute severely limited university self-government. See, G. I. *Universitety v Rossii i ustav 1884 goda* (Moscow, 1976).
23. Rozhdestvensky, *Istoricheskii obzor*, p. 661.
24. Konstantinov, *Ocherki*, p. 29.
25. Alston, *Education*, pp. 125-26.
26. Ministerstvo narodnago prosveshcheniya, *Obzor deiatel'nosti vedomstva Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya za vremia tsarstvovaniia Imperatora Aleksandra III* (St. Petersburg, 1991), pp. 72-74.
27. On politics during the reign of Alexander III, see F. A. Zaionchkovskii, *Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie v kontse XIX stoletiiia* (Moscow, 1970).
28. *Polnoe sobranie*, series 3, IX, 351-52.
29. N. P. Raevym, "Otchet o sostoianii S-Peterburgskikh vysshikh zhenskikh kursov za 1894-1895 uchebnyi god," *ZhMNP*, CCCIII (January, 1896), 7.
30. "Dvadtsatiatiletie S-Peterbusgskikh vysshikh zhenskikh kursov," *ZhMNP* (July, 1905), p. 43; Shokhol, "Meditinskoe obrazovanie," p. 202.
31. Ministerstvo narodnago prosveshcheniya, *Obzor deiatel'nosti*, p. 210.
32. Raevym, "Otchet," p. 6.

Ethnicity and Cultural Retention: Finns in Canada, 1890-1920

J. DONALD WILSON

I. INTRODUCTION

Immigration Patterns

Despite reports that some Finns came to Canada before 1867, it is likely the first ones arrived from Alaska shortly after Russia sold that territory to the United States. Other Finns may have entered eastern Canada via the United States prior to 1875. In any case the first period of major Finnish immigration to this country occurred between 1880 and 1914. Most of these Finns were farmers and some of them artisans from Finland's westernmost provinces. As with many Scandinavian immigrants to Canada, a good many had originally emigrated to the United States, and for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was the prospect of good, cheap land and jobs in railway construction, decided to move northward.

By 1893 the Canadian government had become aware of the desirability of Finnish immigration to the point of establishing a "return man" in Finland whose job it was to recruit immigrants. This agent received a one-way passage to Finland and a small sum of money; his return passage and final payment depended on his success in attracting settlers.¹ From 1895 to 1899 the C. P. R., too, shared this interest in the Finns and its agent, N. D. Ennis, urged Finns to travel to "sunny Canada and become rich."² Thus, by the turn of the century, Canada was making deliberate efforts

to encourage the immigration of Finns, a "sturdy, honest, hard-working, God-fearing folk, used to hardship and toil, obliged to battle in order to live."³

The 1901 census shows there were 2500 Finns in Canada. This figure rose dramatically to 15,497 in 1911 and to 21,494 in 1921. Approximately 10% of the Finns who left Finland during the first two decades of this century went directly to Canada.⁴ Many others crossed the border into Canada after a period in the United States.

With the outbreak of war in 1914 Finnish immigration virtually ceased and did not recommence until the 1920s during which decade a peak number of 30,000 entered the country.⁵ The influx of this decade is explainable in part because of the introduction of an immigrant quota system in the United States in 1924. Thus many America-bound emigrants were deflected to Canada. The depression of the 1930s and the Second World War brought immigration to an almost complete standstill. Then once again another wave of immigration took shape, and in the two decades after 1945, 20,000 Finns came to Canada to settle.⁶ By the 1960s, however, immigration had slowed somewhat and the number of Finns entering Canada fell under 1000 per year.⁷

Settlement Patterns

Although Finnish-Canadians can be found in every province and territory, except Prince Edward Island, they are mainly concentrated in Ontario and British Columbia (see Table 1). Twenty-five years ago, their numbers were almost equally divided between rural and urban domicile (20,102 rural; 23,643 urban). The 1971 census, however, reveals an overwhelming predominance of urban-based Finns (44,925 to 16,290). The four largest urban concentrations of Finns (in descending order) are Toronto, Thunder Bay, Vancouver and Sudbury. Thunder Bay and Sudbury represent "old" Finnish settlement; Toronto's and Vancouver's Finnish communities, on the other hand, have grown enormously since World War II.

Originally engaged for the most part in railroad building, mining, lumbering and mixed farming, Finnish immigrants in the first half of the twentieth century concentrated in the Sudbury-Copper Cliff-Sault Ste. Marie area of northern Ontario and the Port Arthur-Fort William (or Thunder Bay District) of

TABLE 1
PATTERN OF FINNISH SETTLEMENT IN CANADA

	1901	1911	1921	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
Newfoundland	-	-	-	-	-	31	36	45
Prince Edward Island	-	-	-	-	1	7	16	-
Nova Scotia	-	-	43	45	99	159	254	235
New Brunswick	-	-	24	36	135	109	165	145
Quebec	-	-	216	76	2973	2043	1600	2277
Ontario	-	-	869	12835	27137	26827	39906	38515
Manitoba	-	-	1080	505	1013	808	821	1070
Saskatchewan	-	-	1008	1937	2313	1940	1805	1891
Alberta	-	-	1588	2926	3318	3452	2958	3662
British Columbia	-	-	2858	3112	6358	6332	6780	10037
Yukon	-	-	61	21	34	55	50	72
Northwest	-	-	-	-	4	20	48	50
Total	2502	15497	21494	43885	41683	43745	59435	59215
Urban Distribution					17497	23643	40840	44925
Rural Distribution					24186	20102	29199	14290

N.B.: According to Statistics Canada, "Finnish" is a person who claims his mother tongue is Finnish.

northwestern Ontario. In western Canada, Finns were to be found in the Red River Valley and west of Winnipeg in Manitoba; at Tantallon, Wapella and Whitewood (commonly called "New Finland") in southeastern Saskatchewan near the Manitoba border; at Sylvan Lake, west of Red Deer in Alberta; and in the environs of Nanaimo on Vancouver Island. Those who were not rural-based worked as general labourers, in service industries, and often as skilled workers, especially carpenters. Single women and those married women who worked outside the home were often domestic servants, maids or more recently cleaning ladies. (For elaboration on this, see the data relating to Thunder Bay below.)

II. FINNS IN THUNDER BAY: A CASE STUDY

The Finns who came to northwestern Ontario settled in both cities which now form Thunder Bay—Port Arthur and Fort William—as well as the surrounding rural areas. A thorough study has yet to be made of Finns in the townships, but it is known that many settled there before World War I.⁸ There is no firm evidence at this time about the number of Finns in either Canada or Thunder Bay before 1900. During that year, 682 Finns immigrated to Canada and the numbers increased, though by no means evenly, until World War I. In 1913-1914, the numbers peaked at 3,183 and then fell decisively below the 500 mark.⁹ What proportion of these came to Thunder Bay is not certain. The 1901 census does not mention Finns in either Port Arthur or Fort William; apparently they were classed as either Russians or Scandinavians. The Turku study of Finnish emigration in 1905 reports that about 30·7% of the Finns to Canada came to Port Arthur and Fort William.¹⁰ The 1911 census, on the other hand, reveals that 10·6% of Canada's Finns resided in Port Arthur and Fort William during that year.¹¹ The discrepancy between these two sets of figures suggests that there are too many variable factors to determine precisely what proportion of Canada's Finns came to Thunder Bay. The Turku statistics include anyone who gave his destination as Port Arthur or Fort William and ultimately moved on to the rural areas outside Thunder Bay, but they exclude Finns who came to Canada via the United States. The census includes those Finns in Canada who immigrated via the United States but excludes those living in rural areas. Although

it is not possible to give an accurate account of annual Finnish immigration to Thunder Bay, it is certain that by 1911, at least 1643 Finns resided in the cities of Port Arthur and Fort William, comprising 5·9% of their total population.¹² By 1913 Finns exceeded 10% of the total population of Port Arthur and a contemporary observer made note of the prominence of the "Finn Colony" in both cities.¹³

As they sought to build a new life in this area, the Finns came into contact with other Canadians and immigrants through their work. At the same time, they formed organizations within their own ethnic community—churches, temperance societies, and workingmen's associations. There is no evidence that Finns established any formal organizations in Thunder Bay before 1896, at which time the Finnish Lutheran Church was formed in Port Arthur. Until then ceremonies such as baptism, marriage and burial had been conducted at St. John's Anglican Church where the minister had learned to read in Finnish.¹⁴ As with many other ethnic groups, religious organizations became the focal point of many Finns' self-identity.¹⁵ Generally speaking those Finns who did not associate with the church in Thunder Bay joined some socialist organization or other. The origin of the so-called White-Red split among the Finns in Canada is, therefore, at least seventy-five years old.

The Church

At the turn of the twentieth century, three Finnish congregations came into being in Thunder Bay—the Apostolic Lutheran Church (commonly known as the Laestadians), the Port Arthur Finnish Lutheran Church, and the Fort William Finnish Lutheran Church founded in 1897. The Apostolic Church was the centre of life for its members. Drinking was forbidden and thus the need for joining any temperance society was precluded. The Laestadians were also strongly anti-union and kept apart from labour and socialist activities as much as possible. Generally, they remained aloof from association with their fellow Finns and with the wider English-speaking community of Thunder Bay.

The Port Arthur Finnish Lutheran congregation was formed in 1896. The following year land was donated to the congregation and a church was built. The next few years the congregation experienced a period of growth. Regular worship services

and Sunday School were held, a choir was formed, and various picnics and special activities were sponsored.

The long-standing feud between church-going Finns and anti-church, usually socialist, Finns began to heat up after 1910. Church Finns charged that their services were being disrupted. "On Sundays and other days," they charged, "when divine service is being held in the church, the socialists noisily and openly enter and disturb them and their worship." The socialists were described as "a wicked and ungodly people who openly break marriage vows and exchange wives."¹⁶ For the socialists, the church represented the oppressors, the "hired hands of capitalists," and preached the "degradation of life."¹⁷ In Finland the Finnish Lutheran Church at the time held considerable secular as well as spiritual power and influence which was continuously being challenged by the rising socialist movement. But in Thunder Bay before World War I, the struggle against the church seems to have been more symbolic than real. Although church membership lists are not extant, all evidence points to the likelihood that church-going Finns formed a minority of the Finnish population of pre-World War I Port Arthur and probably Fort William as well. Baptismal, marriage and burial figures,¹⁸ however, seem to indicate a continuing desire to turn to the church to perform traditional ceremonial rites even though many of these Finns were certainly not active members of the congregation.

For English-speaking society in Thunder Bay, however, the Finnish church was seen in a different light. It was in the church that the seeds of future Canadian citizens of merit were to be found.¹⁹ For example, Mayor Oliver of Port Arthur, in his speech to the National Church Convention in 1914 said that "he had found Finnish settlers of the Lutheran faith to be most desirable citizens ... and they could do much to help the civic authorities and English-speaking churches in the work of Canadianizing their people and teaching them our laws, etc."²⁰

Thus in the pre-World War I era, the Finnish immigrant church seems to have been more significant for its ideological stance than for its capacity for action. While the church grew slowly and fostered internal convictions which would be transmitted to future generations, it was the socialists who ran in elections, built public halls, published newspapers, and generally captured the limelight.

Temperance Societies

The first Finnish non-religious organizations to be formed in Thunder Bay were the temperance societies. Temperance as a cause had taken root in Finland during the last half of the nineteenth century,²¹ and many immigrants to Canada shared its ideals, namely the encouragement of an active, moral life uncontaminated by alcohol. In Port Arthur the "Uusi Yritys Raittiusseura" or "New Attempt Temperance Society" was formed on February 23, 1902²² and in Fort William, the "Pohjankukka" or "Northern Flower" had its beginnings about the same time.²³ For a few years the Port Arthur organization was very active. Dances, socials, plays, concerts and debates were sponsored and a mutual aid society formed. Membership rose rapidly. Activities were largely confined, however, to the Finnish community. In fact an invitation to join the Royal Templars Temperance Society was turned down.²⁴

From about 1905 it appears that the centre of Finnish activity in Port Arthur began to shift its focus from temperance to workingmen's organizations, and before World War I the former was totally submerged by the latter. The first meeting to discuss the possibility of a socialist organization was held at the end of February, 1903.²⁵ A few months later saw the founding of such an organization known as Imatra #9, a branch of a Brooklyn-based Finnish-American workingmen's association. Interestingly, at least four of the founding members of this organization were also members of the temperance society.²⁶ Early efforts at formal cooperation between the temperance society and Imatra #9 made little progress. The cause which drew them together was a common concern to reduce, if not remove, the evils of alcohol. Socialist objectives, no less than temperance once, could not be attained if the rank-and-file imbibed in the excesses of strong drink. Discussions concerning the erection of a common building, however, proved fruitless. In 1905 membership in the temperance society was double that in Imatra #9.²⁷ Then, from 1906 to 1909, significant shift of members occurred from the temperance to the workingmen's society. By April, 1909 the minutes of Imatra #9 record that the temperance society had proposed joining its ranks. The temperance society offered to give up its assets in return for a share in the new hall, the proposed Finnish Labour Temple which was actually built the following year.²⁸ In 1909

Fort William's temperance society also merged with the Fort William Workingmen's Association. With these two developments the temperance societies seem to have lost most of their influence and finally to have disappeared.²⁹

Workingmen's Associations

There seems little doubt that before World War I the socialists were the dominant force in the Port Arthur Finnish community. The size and general activity of the socialist organizations and their high visibility among both the Finnish and the "kielinen" (non-Finnish speaking) populations lend support to this contention. Although relations with English-speaking labour organizations were usually cordial, Finnish socialists preferred to maintain their own ethnically based associations, namely Imatra #9 and its successor the Finnish Socialist Organization in Port Arthur. Formed in 1903 Imatra #9 sought and obtained membership in the so-called Imatra League formed in Brooklyn, New York in 1890.³⁰ Later, in 1907, the Port Arthur branch fell out with headquarters and sensing the need for a national link in Canada joined the marxist Socialist Party of Canada (S.P.C.). The next year the Fort Willian Finnish Socialist local followed suit. Thunder Bay socialists were also prominent in forming a national organization of Finnish Canadian socialists. This allowed for the provision of a united Finnish voice within the S.P.C. By 1908 fourteen Finnish socialist locals sent delegates to participate in Finnish caucuses at the general S.P.C. meetings.³¹ It was apparent that if Finnish socialists were to play an effective revolutionary role, they must participate in mainstream socialist activity.

Formerly the Thunder Bay socialists had lent financial support to *Tyomies*, the Finnish socialist paper published since 1903 in nearby Superior, Wisconsin. In 1907, however, they began publishing their own newspaper *Tyokansa* (The Working People) and a satirical weekly *Vakaleuka* (The Babbler). Originally published twice a week and eventually in 1912 becoming a daily before bankruptcy closed its presses in 1915, *Tyokansa* became a focal point for the Finnish socialist movement in Canada.³² Only S.P.C. party members could be on the management of the paper.

By the end of 1907 the Finnish socialists felt strong enough to contest the Port Arthur municipal elections. Their efforts, how-

ever, proved futile as not one of their candidates was elected. The two-year period following was a time of difficulty and confusion for the Finnish-Canadian socialists. In 1910 they were evicted from the Socialist Party of Canada. One interpretation suggests the origin of the split lay in the English-speaking members' resentment of immigrant workers who, they feared, were taking jobs which properly belonged to 'Canadians'.³³ Another account suggests that the split occurred between those favouring solely political, parliamentary action and those favouring emphasis on economic improvements through non-parliamentary means.³⁴

In 1911 the societies, both Finnish and non-Finnish, which had been evicted from the Socialist Party of Canada decided to organize themselves anew. A conference in Winnipeg formalized a new constitution and launched a party under the name of the Social Democratic Party of Canada. Once again the Finnish delegates met in a separate caucus, and subsequently decided to form a Finnish-Canadian socialist organization of their own with headquarters in Toronto. This organization became known as the Finnish Socialist Organization of Canada (Canadian Suomalainen Sosialistijarjestö). In March, 1914, the F. S. O. held its first convention in Port Arthur. By this time it had sixty-four member groups comprising 3,062 members.³⁵

The period immediately before the First World War seems to have been the heyday for socialism among the Finns of Thunder Bay. Then in 1915 the membership of the Finnish Socialist Organization dropped from 3,062 to 1,867³⁶ and the *Tyokansa*, by then publishing daily, was forced to close down. A period of ideological confusion followed. The Finnish Socialist Federation of the Social Democratic Party of Canada was declared illegal by order-in-Council on September 25, 1918. When Finnish socialism reappeared as a force in the 1920s, it was to be in a vastly different form. Some Finns joined the syndicalists represented in Canada and the United States by the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) and in Canada for a brief period by the One Big Union (OBU).³⁷ This faction advocated "direct action" through industry-wide and general strikes and through assuming control of factories. The other and larger faction, represented in Canada after 1922 by the Communist Party, insisted on a programme of political action directed against capitalism.

The Finns who dropped the latter position joined the Finnish Organization of Canada which was incorporated in 1923. Both factions were particularly active in organizing Finnish-Canadian lumber workers in northwestern Ontario.³⁸ Finns, together with Ukrainians, became the backbone of the rank-and-file of the Communist Party of Canada.³⁹

Perception of Finns by Host Society

When Finnish immigrants settled in Canada before World War I, their reception by the predominantly Anglo-Celtic host society was affected by currently held views about immigrants. By some, all immigrants were perceived as "hordes," and the source of most crime, pauperism, and illiteracy in Canada. Generally, the Anglo-Celtic host society assumed that its civilization was superior in biological, racial, social, religious and political terms.⁴⁰ This conviction which grew from a mixture of Social Darwinism, the Protestant ethic, the Aryan myth, Anglo-Saxon racism and pride in the British Empire led the host society to judge immigrants according to their presumed assimilability. On this scale of perception, the British, Americans, Scandinavians, Germans and French were the most desirable immigrants. The Slavs and southern Europeans were less so but, nevertheless, capable ultimately of entering the Canadian way of life. Finally, Arabs, Orientals, and Negroes were seen as incapable of assimilation and hence ideally to be barred from entering Canada.⁴¹ The highest class of immigrant was thus from Northern Europe, from countries of Teutonic race, Protestant religion, and "popular" government.⁴² The less desirable immigrants were admitted for economic reasons; there was never any premise that they had much to contribute culturally or intellectually to the life of Canada.

According to this scale of values, the Finns were accepted as members of the Northern European community. Although not of Teutonic race, they were, according to one assessment of 1909, quite desirable because of their proximity to Scandinavia and their love of freedom.

..... long residence near the Scandinavian people has influenced them greatly. Many of those from the coast—the district from which most of our immigrants come—can hardly be distinguished from the Swedes. The attempted "Russification of Finland" has met with great opposition from this

intelligent, sturdy people. Many of them prefer to leave their homes rather than sacrifice their independence⁴³

In Thunder Bay the attitudes of the host society towards the Finns seem to have ranged from indifference to mild tolerance. At least as far as these attitudes were publicly revealed in the press, there was little overt hostility. The first mention of Finns in the English language press occurred in 1907 when the Finnish socialists decided to run a slate of candidates in the municipal election.⁴⁴ After this time, the Finns were mentioned more frequently usually in association with sports or politics. The newspapers did not approve of the Finnish socialists, but this was due to the latter's political ideology rather than to their ethnicity. In an editorial entitled "The Finnish Socialists," the *Daily News* made it clear that the Finns in general were accepted as potentially good citizens while the socialist Finns, although not posing an immediate threat, were perceived as less desirable than their so-called non-political countrymen.⁴⁵ Another article in the *Daily News* mentioned the hard work of the Finns, the attractiveness of the Labour Temple, the eagerness of the Finns to learn English, and the fact that most Finns were by no means socialists. There were also liberal references to the "tyranny of Russia" and the people "sent from Finland to suffer and die in the deserts of Siberia, or in a cell in a Russian prison." An editorial in the same issue entitled 'For our Finnish Friends' seconded the sentiments of the article but expressed the "poor little Finland" theme more eloquently :

We fancy that a demonstration in Port Arthur of contempt for and protest against Russian atrocities, could not be better manifested than by consenting to extend to the Finnish residents of the city the small concession for which they ask [tax exemption for the Labour Temple].⁴⁶

Finns at Work

A social survey of Port Arthur and Fort William commissioned by the Methodist and Presbyterian churches in 1913 referred to the Finns as "the aristocracy" of the non-English-speaking immigrant labour population.⁴⁷ In this capacity they stood among the ranks of the "ever-increasing horde of unskilled workers" who had entered the Canadian Lakehead since the turn of the century.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, as the aristocracy, the Finns were said to provide

"the link connecting the immigrant with the artisan class", composed mainly of English-speaking skilled labourers. The first class above the artisans and unskilled workers consisted of the wealthy early settlers "who have grown up with the City", and the business and professional men.⁴⁹

A recent study of occupations of male Finns in Port Arthur in 1911 corroborates the social survey's classification of Finns, in the main, in the third class.⁵⁰ Almost 70% of male Finns in the study were general labourers. Less than 10% were skilled workers (see Table 2). In Fort William the percentage of male Finns who were general labourers was even higher exceeding 83%. Of the working women in Port Arthur (estimated to be 16·4% of the total Finnish female population in 1911), the majority (40·3%) were hotel staff. Usually unmarried, these women lived in their place of work, serving as cooks, chambermaids, waitresses and maids. Clerks and domestics comprised another 25% of the female labour force, and with a single exception they worked for non-Finns. Thus, a general picture of the Port Arthur Finnish labour force emerges : the males were primarily general labourers and the females, servants. However, at the same time a business community was coming into being and some Finns were being employed at skilled labour.

TABLE 2

A. Occupations of male Finns in Port Arthur, 1911 :

General labourers	253	69·1%
Skilled labourers*	34	9·3%
Business proprietors	15	4·1%
Tyokansa employees	11	3·0%
Clerks	9	2·5%
Managers, secretaries	5	1·4%
Others	2	·5%
Unknown	37	10·1%
	366	

* Skilled labour was defined in the Kouhi study to include artisans (carpenters, stonecutters, tinsmiths, blacksmiths, electricians, watchmakers, stonemasons, plasterers), those in service trades, (tailors, barbers, bakers, butchers), as well as a miner, a fisherman and four farmers.

B. Occupations of male Finns in Fort William, 1911:

General labourers	180	83·4%
Others	7	3·2%
Unknown	29	13·4%
	216	

C. Occupations of female Finns in Port Arthur, 1911:

Hotel staff	29	40·3%
Clerks	10	13·9%
Domestics	9	12·5%
Others**	8	11·1%
Unknown	16	22·2%
	72	

D. Occupations of female Finns in Fort William, 1911:

Hotel staff	11	
Unknown	1	
	12	

This working environment had a dual effect on the immigrant Finns. In one sense it was restrictive in that the majority of Finns were confined to general labour jobs. This occurred partly because many of the Finns were unskilled, partly because of language difficulties, but also because the immigrants were perceived by native-born Canadians to in some sense "belong" to the labouring class. In another sense, the effect of the indifferent, if not hostile, milieu into which the Finns immigrated was positive. They were forced to rely on their fellow compatriots for material aid and companionship, and as a result formed organizations of various kinds—churches, temperance societies and workingmen's associations. Before World War I at least, all of these groups led an extremely active existence, attending to the material, social and intellectual welfare of their members.

It appears too that the Finns preferred to order their lives within the context of their own ethnic community as much as

** This figure includes 3 bookkeepers, 2 laundresses, a nurse, a bath attendant, and a dressmaker.

Table borrowed from Christine Kouhi, "Labour and Finnish immigration to Thunder Bay, 186-1914," *Lakehead University Review*, Vol. IX, No. 1 (Spring, 1976), pp. 25-6.

possible. The reluctance of both the temperance and working-men's societies to enter any formal relationship with sympathetic English-speaking or *kielinen* groups supports this thesis. The Finns who in most cases worked in an alien environment seem to have felt the need to balance this experience with others in which their familiar language, customs, and modes of thinking were preserved.

Education

The public school was assigned the role of breaking down ethnic loyalties to mother country, language, and custom, and Canadianizing the "foreigners". The Finns seem to have acquired a reputation for a willingness to go to school, learn English and become 'Canadian' during the pre-World War I period,⁵¹ but the schooling process itself was just starting and its effects are difficult to document precisely.

A recent study of Finnish settlements in rural Thunder Bay suggests, however, that the most powerful external influence on these rural communities was the school. The study reports these Finns "had a high regard for education and their communities without exception contained schools"⁵² The establishment of a school required a good deal of local initiative since before government grants could be obtained, a building had to be erected and a teacher hired by the settlers themselves. Harsh and variable weather conditions, pressure on students to work on the farm, and the transiency of teachers in rural schools made for a varying standard of education. The curriculum rarely ventured beyond the three Rs and a healthy dose of patriotism—to the British Empire. Nevertheless, the children of rural Finnish immigrants did learn English. Few made it beyond elementary school, however, as the economic demands of work and the longer distance to high school in town mitigated against further schooling. Such was a common phenomenon in rural Canada before World War II.

Conclusion

The pre-World War I period for the Finnish immigrants in Thunder Bay was one of establishment. They came to form a visible segment of the population of Port Arthur and Fort William (now Thunder Bay), and made a lasting impact on the rural areas west and north of the twin cities. Finnish rural life reached the

peak of its vitality in the 1930s, fell into decline about 1940 and has not revived since. Among the reasons for rural depopulation, the following may be suggested. The war and war-related industries in the cities drew young people away. Secondly, land once adequate for subsistence-type farming could no longer support the demands made on it by a more sophisticated agricultural economy. Thus as the original settlers died off, no new ones came to replace them. Thirdly, second generation Finns, taught the values and language of the dominant English-speaking culture, no longer felt the need or desire for the security of a specifically Finnish ethnic community.

In Thunder Bay itself, the Finnish presence remained visible after the war and does so even today.⁵³ The city still boasts a very active "Finn Town" dominated by the Finlandia Club Hall (the former Finnish Labour Temple), a much smaller "Red Finn Hall," several Finnish churches, and numerous Finnish business establishments concentrated on Bay Street in Port Arthur ward. The language is taught in local high schools and also at Lakehead University by an instructor supplied by the Ministry of Education in Finland. Formerly the largest concentration of Finns in Canada, Thunder Bay now takes second place to Toronto which, with Vancouver, has been the most popular destination for Finnish immigrants to Canada since World War II.

While elements of behavioural assimilation can be observed among the city's Finnish Canadians, it is also true that they have nurtured their own language and traditions brought with them or by their ancestors from Finland. They have sought to maintain a specifically Finnish identity, one which separated them in the past and in many cases still separates them today from all other residents of the Thunder Bay cities. In this sense they provide a prototype of the ethnic experience of many ethnic groups in Canada. Thus to come to understand their interaction with mainstream Canadian society helps one to appreciate what is meant by multiculturalism in Canada today. As the recent OECD review of Canadian education so ably phrased it :

Strong cultural minorities are a hindrance only from the perspective of the traditional nation-state. They will become increasingly an asset for the future of the more advanced countries.... By leading the way, Canada might set an excellent example for others to follow.⁵⁴

FOOTNOTE

- * Special thanks are extended to a former student of mine, Ms. Christine Kouhi, who was responsible for translating most of the materials concerning the Thunder Bay Finns which originally appeared in Finnish.
1. Dominion of Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 1894, Vol. XXXVII, No. 10, #13, p. 5.
 2. Reino Kero, *Migration from Finland to North America in the Years Between the United States Civil War and the First World War* (Turku: Turku University, 1974), p. 167.
 3. Report to Department of Interior by Dr. H. Walton reporting from Scandinavia. *Sessional Papers*, 1898, Vol. XXXII, No. 10, #13, p. 67.
 4. Tauri Aaltio, "A Survey of Emigration from Finland to the United States and Canada," in Ralph J. Jalkanen (ed.), *The Finns in North America: A Social Symposium*. (Hancock, Michigan: Suomi College, 1969), p. 68.
 5. *The Canadian Family Tree* (Ottawa: Department of Secretary of State, 1967), p. 116.
 6. *Ibid.*
 7. DBS, 1964, Table 6, p. 204; DBS, 1966, Table 6, p. 229; DBS, 1969; Table 5, p. 209; Statistics Canada, 1972, Table 4, p. 226.
 8. A valuable beginning was made in 1975 by Project Bay Street, No. 2, a group of amateur historians funded by a summer grant from the Department of Secretary of State. Their findings together with many photographs were published as *A Chronicle of Finnish Settlements in Rural Thunder Bay* (Thunder Bay: Finnish-Canadian Historical Society of Thunder Bay, 1975).
 9. Statistics compiled by Canada, Department of Immigration for Project Bay Street, No. 1, 1974.
 10. Statistics compiled by Emigration History Research Center, University of Turku, Turku, Finland: Canada: 853 Finns, Port Arthur, 194; Fort William, 68.
 11. Census of Canada, 1911: Number of Finns in Canada, 15,500; in Port Arthur and Fort William, 1643.
 12. *Ibid.* Total population of both cities, 27,719.
 13. Bryce M. Stewart, *Report of a Preliminary and General Social Survey of Port Arthur* (Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, 1913), pp. 3, 5; Stewart, *Report of a Preliminary and General Social Survey of Fort William* (Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, 1913), p. 22.
 14. Preface to the Minute Books of Bethel Lutheran Church, Port Arthur.
 15. For an excellent study of the dimensions of religio-ethnicity in the United States, see Timothy L. Smith, "Religious Denominations as Ethnic Communities: A Regional Case Study," *Church History*, Vol. XXXV, No. 2 (June, 1966), pp. 207-226.
 16. Arthur *Daily News*, May 20, 1913.
 17. *Tyokansan Nuoli* (Port Arthur, 1909), p. 9. Copies of Port Arthur Finnish

- newspapers referred to in this paper may be found on microfilm in the Lakehead University Archives.
18. Minutes of the Port Arthur Finnish Lutheran Church (Bethel).
 19. *Daily News*, May 20, 1913.
 20. *Ibid.*, July 9, 1914.
 21. Tellervo Kahara, "Temperance Society *Uusi Yritys*", *Project Bay Street*, No. 1 (Thunder Bay, 1974), p. 1. See also Seppo Vaittinen, "Aatteiden Murrokset" in Pekka Suhonen et al., *Sata Suomalaisen Kulttuurin Vuotta* (Porvoo : WSOY, 1974), pp. 45-146.
 22. Minute Books of the "Uusi Yritys Raittiusseura" (New Attempt Temperance Society), Feb. 23, 1902. Housed at Lakehead University Archives. (Hereafter referred to as U. Y. R. Minutes).
 23. Nick Viita, "The Origins of the Canadian Finnish Labour Movement", *Industrialisti*, October 9 and 13, 1970. Translation by A. I. Tolvanen, p. 2 of this manuscript, Lakehead University Archives.
 24. U. Y. R. Minutes, Feb. 23, 1904.
 25. Minutes of the executive of the workingmen's society, Imatra #9 (Lakehead University Archives). Forty-three members are listed.
 26. U. Y. R. Membership Book, 1905.
 27. 224 to 117 members. U. Y. R. Membership Book, 1905; Imatra minutes, "Virosikertomus, 1905" (Annual Report).
 28. Imatra #9 Minutes, Apr. 29, 1909.
 29. It is interesting to note that in respect to Finns in the United States, Reino Kero places 1910 as a turning point in the decline of temperance societies and the ascendancy of the socialist labour movement. He also notes the same pattern of socialist "takeover" of temperance society halls. The procedure progressed from first joining the temperance societies to eventually using the halls for their own purposes once they were in the majority. Reino Kero, "Finnish Immigrant Culture in America", in Vilho Niitemaa, et al. (eds.), *Old Friends - Strong Ties* (Turku : Institute for Migration, 1976), pp 117-18; 124.
 30. Imatra's purpose was to promote higher aspirations and mutual aid among Finnish-American workers. See Auvo Kostiainen, "Finnish-American Workmen's Association", in *Ibid.*, pp. 208-209.
 31. Viita (Tolvanen trans.), p. 4.
 32. For an analysis of the *Tyokansa*'s bankruptcy, see *Tyokansa*, June 15, 1915. Its successor, *Vapaus* (Freedom), began publication in Sudbury in November, 1917, and merged in 1974 with the literary weekly *Liekki* to form *Viikkosanomat*, published weekly in Toronto. *Tyokansa* was not the only publication of the Finnish Building Company which was located in the Labour Temple. They also published *Kevat-Valo* (1911), *Murtava Voima* (1908), *Tyokansan Nuoli* (1909-1910), and *Vakaleuka* (1910-1915). Copies obtained from Helsinki University Library are available on microfilm at Lakehead University Archives.

33. J. W. Ahlqvist, "Jarjestomme Toiminta Vuoteen 1920", *Canadian Suomalainen Jarjestö : 25 Vuotta* (Sudbury : Vapaus, 1936), p. 35. Ahlqvist has been instrumental in persuading the Canadian socialist Finns to join the Socialist Party of Canada.
34. Viita, p. 8.
35. Ahlqvist, p. 38.
36. *Ibid.*
37. For Background to the IWW in Canada and the OBU, see A. Ross McCormack, "The Industrial Workers of the World in Western Canada : 1905-1914," *Historical Papers (C. H. A.)*, 1975, pp. 167-190; David J. Bercuson, "Western Labour Radicalism and the One Big Union : Myths and Realities," in S. M. Trofimenkoff (ed.), *The Twenties in Western Canada* (Ottawa : National Museum of Man, 1972), pp. 32-49; Gerald Friesen, "'Yours in Revolt' : Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement", *Labour/Le Travailleur*, Vol. I (1976), pp. 139-157. For an account of Finnish-Americans and the I. W. W., see Kostiainen, "Finnish-American Workmen's Associations", pp. 212-13; 218-19; Douglas Ollila, Jr., "From Socialism to Industrial Unionism (IWW) : Social Factors in the Emergence of Left-Labor Radicalism among Finnish Workers on the Mesabi, 1911-19," in Michael Karni, Matti Kaups and Douglas Ollila (eds.), *The Finnish Experience in the Western Great Lakes Region : New Perspectives* (Turku : Institute for Migration, 1975), pp. 156-171.
38. A. T. Hill, "Historic Basis and Development of the Lumber Workers' Organization and Struggles in Ontario" (ca. 1952). Manuscript in possession of author. Hill has been a leading communist for over half a century. Now resident in Thunder Bay, he was imprisoned in Kingston Penitentiary in 1931 along with Tim Buck and six other Communist leaders. He was an active contributor to *Vapaus* and for many years ran the *Vapaus* Bookstore in Thunder Bay.
39. Ivan Avakumovic, *The Communist Party in Canada : A History* (Toronto : McClelland and Stewart, 1975), p. 24. In the United States, Finns made up 48·5% of the membership of the Workers' Party of America (Communist) in 1922. Auvo Kostiainen, "Amerikansuomalaisen Tyovaenliikkeen Tutkimuksesta," *Siirtolaisuus/Migration*, 1976, 1, p. 29.
40. Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power : Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914* (Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 117-188; Christine Bolt, *Victorian Attitudes to Race* (Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1971), pp. 1-28 ; 206-223.
41. For an excellent summary of Canadian attitudes towards assimilation since the turn of the century, see Howard Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts : Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century," in *Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism : Multiculturalism as State Policy* (Ottawa, 1976), pp. 81-118. The same author's "Mosaic versus Melting Pot : Immigration and Ethnicity in Canada and the United States," *International Journal*, Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (Summer, 1976),

- 488-528, is also most enlightening on comparisons between the United States and Canada with respect to immigration and assimilation.
42. Carl Berger, "The True North Strong and Free," in Peter Russell (ed.), *Nationalism in Canada* (Toronto, McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 3-26.
 43. J. S. Woodsworth, *Strangers Within Our Gates* (orig. pub. 1909; reissued University of Toronto Press, 1972), p. 74.
 44. *Daily News*, Dec. 20, 1907.
 45. *Ibid.*, Aug. 24, 1908.
 46. *Daily News*, June 11, 1970. The appeal to "Russian Tyranny" seems to have been a popular one when Finns made an appeal of any kind to the English. A request from the *Tyokansa* for advertising from the Department of the interior begins "As you no doubt know how the tyranny of Russia now oppresses the small nation of Finland" (J. V. Kannasto, M. Hahl, and George McKela to Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher, Feb. 6, 1911, Public Archives of Canada, Vol. 25, File 651). At the time of the founding in 1901 of the Finnish utopian socialist settlement of Sointula on the west coast of British Columbia, there was similar repeated reference in the local English press to the despotic nature of Russian rule which was leading the "freedom-loving" Finns to seek emigration "in order to escape the tyranny and oppression of the Russian government." See, for example, *Vancouver Province*, April 9, 1901; *Victoria Colonist*, April 11, 1901. For details on Sointula, see my "Matti Kurikka: Finnish-Canadian Intellectual," *B. C. Studies*, No. 20 (Winter, 1973-74), pp. 50-65.
 47. Stewart, *Port Arthur Survey*, p. 5.
 48. Stewart, *Fort William Survey*, p. 10.
 49. Stewart, *Port Arthur Survey*, p. 5.
 50. Christine Kouhi, "Labour and Finnish Immigration to Thunder Bay, 1876-1914," *Lakehead University Review*, Vol. IX, No. 1 (Spring, 1976), pp. 22-28.
 51. Stewart, *Port Arthur Survey*, p. 4.
 52. *A Chronicle of Finnish Settlements in Rural Thunder Bay*, p. 19. The same respect for schooling was evident among Finns in United States. See Tauri Aaltio, "A Survey of Emigration from Finland to the United States and Canada," in Ralph J. Jalkanen (ed.), *The Finns in North America*, p. 67.
 53. M. J. Metsaranta, "Ethnic Residential Concentration and Succession in the former city of Port Arthur" (Unpublished B. A. thesis, Lakehead University, 1972).
 54. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Canada* (Paris: OECD, 1976), p. 115.

Female Power in Changing India : Myth or Reality ?

HEATHER T. FRAZER

Billboards in Delhi advertise slacks with the caption "For whoever wears the pants in your family." Indira Gandhi served as Prime Minister of India for more than a decade. Newspapers in the capital city carried more reports from the International Women's Year Conference in Mexico City than did many of their Western counterparts. The subject of "female power" is in vogue in many parts of the world and India is no exception. To what extent are these happenings indicative of profound or even revolutionary change in the status of women in India?¹ Has change been experienced uniformly throughout the country, and has it operated in economic, social, and political spheres? Is female power a myth or is it a reality in contemporary India?

The obedient, submissive Indian woman is a well-known stereotype, but it is primarily a creation of the patriarchs of the Vedic period who warned: "Woman is a great whirlpool of suspicion, a dwelling-place of vices, full of deceits, a hindrance in the way of heaven, the gate of hell."² In pre-Aryan times Indian women worked together with men in tilling the soil and reaping the harvests. They participated with men in festival and religious rituals.³ Some of this respect for women carried over into Aryan times when the *Lawbook of Manu* declared, "Where women verily are honored, there the gods rejoice; where, however, they are not

honored, there all sacred rites prove fruitless." Gradually, however, there was a turn away from the values of the Earth Mother toward the increasing glorification of the male.

The Indian woman today is rarely considered as an individual. Instead she is viewed in her roles of daughter, wife, or mother. Since she is thought to be lacking any internalized norms or self-discipline, it is imperative that her father, husband, and sons protect her from herself and the outside world. This submissive position is reinforced by institutions of caste, religion, joint family, and village. A woman who abdicates her traditionally sanctioned roles is liable to experience severe censure.⁴

Due to the very limitations placed upon women by the nature of their roles, initial attempts to improve the condition of women were undertaken by men. From Ram Mohan Roy through Gandhi, many reformers viewed the excessive restrictions placed upon women as social evils requiring amelioration.⁵ The reform movements of the nineteenth century addressed themselves to the position of women within the family. In the early twentieth century a few women became interested in similar problems, but they began to emphasize new areas outside of the family—such as education, welfare programs, and suffrage. In 1917 for instance, Sarojini Naidu led a deputation to the British Parliament demanding the vote for women which was granted in limited form by the Reforms Act of 1921.

The number of women involved in politics mushroomed as the fight for self government intensified in the decades following World War I. In addition to Naidu, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Vijay Lakshmi Pandit (Indira Gandhi's aunt), and Kamladevi Chattopadhyaya were simply a few of the many women who found themselves catapulted out of more traditional roles and into the public sector in their support of *swaraj*, or self-government.⁶

Indira Gandhi, of course, is a prime representative of this post-World War I generation. Her extraordinary family background combined with her participation in the struggle for Indian independence gave her unique access to the political world. In other times she and many other women would not have been able to play non-traditional female roles.⁷

Activists such as Naidu, Kaur, Pandit, Chattopadhyaya, and Indira Gandhi as well as many other women in India were pro-

foundly influenced by M. K. Gandhi.⁸ He held a positive view toward women and worked for their equality. In fact, he referred to women as "the better half of mankind"⁹ and expected them to lead the way in supporting "truth and *ahimsa* in every walk of life."¹⁰ He supported their demand for the vote and viewed female equality as a necessary step in the improvement of Indian life. Gandhi did not advocate radical changes in the traditional roles of wife and mother, and he did not emphasize education for them, but he did believe that women had positive roles to play in the reconstruction of Indian society. He encouraged women to become involved in the freedom struggle, and in 1931 the Indian National Congress committed itself to women's political and legal equality without discrimination. This promise was later embodied in the Indian Constitution of 1950.

The drafters of the Constitution departed radically from the traditional female stereotype and suggested that every woman should function as a responsible citizen of India. The Preamble to the Constitution promises "equality of status and opportunity." However, no comprehensive program of legislation was undertaken to translate the promise of equality into reality.¹¹ The legislation that was passed by the Lok Sabha was inadequate and piecemeal in nature. For example, the Special Marriage Act of 1954 and the Hindu Marriage Act of 1955 fixed the minimum age for marriage and declared bigamy unlawful. But child marriage and bigamy still occur in India, particularly among the Muslims who follow their own Muslim law. Legislation has also been passed to curb the dowry system (Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961). This act is ineffectual, and the practice of dowry appears to be increasing rather than decreasing. The custom has all the characteristics of a market transaction and, in common with child marriage and bigamy, is demeaning to women.

To obtain a comprehensive picture of all issues relating to the rights and status of women and to establish a guideline for the formulation of social policies, the Government of India appointed the Committee on the Status of Women in India in 1971. The Committee was instructed (1) "to assess the impact of the constitutional, legal and administrative provisions on the social status of women, their education and employment," (2) "to examine the status of women in the changing social pattern," and (3) "to suggest remedial measures."¹² After three years of intense

investigation, the Committee issued its lengthy report in December 1974. This report provides invaluable information on all aspects of Indian life affecting the status of women.

The Committee recognized the many difficulties in investigating the position of women in India today. Inequalities are inherent in the traditional social structure of India, and the diversity and complexity of the structure make broad generalizations impossible. Disparities in education and in urbanization compound the problem. Social change has not affected Indian women in a uniform manner. Nevertheless, the Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in India broadens our understanding of the changes which have taken place affecting the condition of women. After a brief consideration of the demographic perspective, the Committee presented its findings on women in the work force, educational opportunities for women, and participation by women in the political process.

Demographically, several disturbing trends are obvious. First, there has been a steady decline in the sex ratio in this century. Unlike the pattern in most western countries, the male population in India has grown at a faster rate than the female population. This pattern is partially explained by the fact that the more highly regarded males receive more care and benefits from birth onward than the less highly regarded females.¹³ Due to this neglect and the high toll of childbirth, life expectancy for women is 45·6 years and 47·1 for males. This gap has actually been increasing, not decreasing, over the last fifty years.¹⁴ Another hiatus occurs in the literacy figures for men and women. The few women who hold high political or academic positions mask the appalling fact that only 18·4% of the female population is literate, compared to 39·5% for males.¹⁵

On the subject of women in the work force, one finds that the number of working women has actually declined over the last sixty years. In 1911 the percentage of women in the total labor force was 34·44% but by 1971 the percentage had dropped to 17·35%.¹⁶ Although there are definite data limitations—particularly regarding information on women workers in the unorganized sector of the economy—these are staggering statistics. The high rate of illiteracy, ignorance regarding job and training opportunities, a decline in household industries coupled with the

increase in modern industry requiring skilled workers, the negative social status associated with women holding jobs in the service sector, the general rise in unemployment—all these help to explain the decline. It is interesting to note that even though there has been a marginal increase in the number of women in white-collared jobs, this increase has been offset by the disappearance of women from trade and commerce due to the modernization of the Indian economy.

The number of women workers in professional and technical fields has been rising since 1960, although their proportion to the total number of employees has remained the same. Women are concentrated in the fields of teaching and medicine, and there has been increasing recognition of certain low prestige jobs in the clerical services as particularly suited to women—a repetition of a pattern all too familiar to women in the West.¹⁷ Constitutional guarantees of non-discrimination, increased educational opportunities, and “emancipation born out of [economic] necessity” are the primary factors responsible for the rise of women in these non-traditional fields.¹⁸

There is an interesting paradox in the relationship between education and the employment of women. The Indian economy experiences severe difficulties in employing all men of working age. Few incentives exist, therefore, to overcome traditional opposition to economic participation by women in the organized sector of the economy regardless of educational levels. As a result, a large number of educated women from middle class backgrounds have continued to accept restrictive attitudes rather than fight traditional values or seek a position in an uncertain job market.¹⁹

For the uneducated woman without technical skills, there is a woeful lack of on-the-job training programs. For example, out of 52,500 apprentices trained under the Apprentices Act of 1961, only 104 were women and were confined to the traditionally more “feminine” occupations such as book-binding and general clerical work.²⁰

The vast majority of women in India work in the unorganized sector of the economy and as this area is without protective measures and machinery, information about this group is meager. It is a fact, that 94% of women workers are in this sector and

they are greater victims of both unemployment and underemployment than women working in the organized sector.²¹ Women suffer because of their dependence caused by limited employment opportunities, illiteracy, deficient training, restricted mobility, and lack of autonomous status. Working women in India have a long way to go before they reach parity with working men in India.

Inequality continues to be readily apparent in education. The enrollment of girls in school is still far behind that of boys. In 1973-74 it was estimated that almost twice as many boys than girls between ages 6-11 attended school.²² Nevertheless, compared to the development of women's education prior to independence, progress has been rapid. For example, in 1947 only 3.5 million girls were enrolled in primary school as compared with 24.4 million in 1973-74.²³ Nevertheless, enrollment for girls continues to be lower than for boys while the drop-out rate is greater.²⁴

Although the female literacy rate has increased significantly in the past seventy years,²⁵ the actual number of illiterate women has increased from 161.9 million in 1950-51 to 215.3 million in 1970-71.²⁶ The majority of literate women are under 24 and have had only primary education.²⁷ Thus the typical adult woman who is trying to operate effectively in the economy of India and bring up her children is, by and large, illiterate.

Attitudes toward education for women vary tremendously, with the urban middle classes voicing the most support for schooling. For people below the subsistence level, girls are too busy serving as unpaid workers within their families to go to school. Early marriage or betrothal, inadequate educational facilities, distance from school, irrelevance of educational material, and fear of alienation are other elements retarding the acceptance of education for girls.²⁸

In some cases education improves a girl's marriage prospects, and this fact gains some social support for their schooling. An educated bride, however, requires an even better educated bridegroom thus necessitating a larger dowry. This prospect sometimes compels parents to withdraw their daughters from school after the primary grades.²⁹ India prides herself on her acceptance of the equality of women as right and natural,³⁰ but it is difficult to talk about true equality when parity in educational opportunity is

lacking.

These deficiencies also affect participation by women in the political process. A number of obvious questions come to mind when examining the political status of women in India today. To what degree have women participated in elections as voters and as candidates? What political attitudes do they hold? What impact have they had on the political process? In investigating the participation of women as voters in elections, a definite correlation exists between literacy and voter turnout³¹ and there has been a steady increase in the percentage of women voting in elections.³² It is very difficult, however, to generalize about political behaviour as there are so many variations depending on the region and the social and economic status of the woman.

Women candidates for office remain few. It is interesting to note that although the number of female candidates for the Lok Sabha increased from 65 in 1962 to 86 in 1971, the number of women elected declined from 33 in 1962 to 21 in 1971, a substantial drop. Women who participated in the freedom movement often went on, as we have seen, to active involvement in politics after independence. This generation is now retiring either because of age or disillusionment with the political process. Their successors do not have the same experience and articulateness, their names are not usually well-known and, consequently, they are experiencing greater difficulties in getting elected. Additional elements preventing more women from active involvement in the political process are the increasing expense of running for office, threats of violence, and character assassination.³³

Although there seems to be an increasing awareness of the power of the vote, this attitude is coupled with the belief that the political parties have neglected women. Disillusionment is widespread and 42% of women interviewed in a study done in Rajasthan in 1971 supported "revolution for social progress" as opposed to the "ritual" of elections.³⁴

Women today are concerned with problems that affect them directly such as rising prices, adulteration of food, unemployment, and poverty. The political parties are not courting women by appealing to them with positive programs dealing with these issues. The Committee on the Status of Women notes that the unity between political, economic and social issues was

one of the causes for Women's high degree of participation. The divorce between social problems that affect women directly, and the political process, has been one of the major causes of women's lower participation in politics in recent years.³⁵

Profound change does not seem to have affected the roles of women in India. We see both regressive and progressive change affecting women in the working force, education, and politics. As economic conditions improve for the lower castes or classes, these groups tend to adopt the discriminatory conservative values held by the upper castes. In adopting these social values they feel they are raising their social status. Only the upper castes or classes, with increasing urbanization and education, are turning away from the traditional social values and embracing a more "modern" ideology which favors equality for women. Based on these considerations, future positive changes in the position of women will probably proceed haltingly and unevenly.

Although women do not constitute a numerical minority, they continue to have that status because of the inequality of class, education, and political power. The Committee on the Status of Women concludes that if this state continues, women in India may emerge as the only surviving minority exposed to such injustices.³⁶ "The chasm between the values of a new social order proclaimed by the Constitution and the realities of contemporary Indian society as far as women's rights are concerned remains as great as at the time of independence."³⁷

It has been argued that the greatest indicator of a positive position enjoyed by women in India is that the country was ruled by a woman for eleven years. But this contention is pure myth. The term "female power" is an anachronism. Perhaps it belongs to some future period in India; it is not a viable part of the present. Revolutionary change has not taken place and apparently there are no strong forces at work trying to bring about profound transformation in the status of women for the immediate future.

The granting of equal rights to women in the Constitution has built an illusion of equality and power which can not be translated into reality unless the traditional attitudes towards a woman's role in society are altered.³⁸ Profound changes in these

attitudes will signify a real revolution which cannot be initiated simply by writing a promise of equality into the Preamble to the Constitution or the passing of social legislation. These measures are steps toward equality, to be sure, but in themselves they have not brought about the desired ends.

FOOTNOTE

1. What is "revolutionary"? Chalmers Johnson has one of the best contemporary definitions of revolution. He suggests that a revolution must embody violence directed toward a change of (1) government, (2) regime, or (3) society. Our concern with changes in the status of women would fall topically under Chalmers third area for revolutionary change-society. This includes attempts to alter social structure, the system of property control, class domination, or the existing value system. Note that Chalmers, in common with most students of revolution, considers violence to be a prime component of a revolution. Violence has not been a characteristic of attempts made by women in India to improve their status. It seems more relevant, therefore, to adopt a pre-eighteenth century definition of revolution—one not tinged with the excesses of the French Revolution. There is no need to look for the inauguration of a new order. Significant change in or the transformation of the traditional position of women in India will become our working definition of "revolutionary". See Chalmers Johnson, *Revolution and the Social System* (Stanford, 1964) and *Revolutionary Change* (Boston, 1966). Perez Zagrin, in an excellent survey of current theories regarding revolution, "Theories of Revolution in Contemporary Historiography," *Political Science Quarterly*, 88 (March 1973), 23-52, suggests that Chalmers should add change in governmental policy as a fourth area.
2. Taken from Ramabai Sarasvati's *The High-Caste Hindu Woman* (Philadelphia, 1888), p. 57.
3. Tara Ali Baig, "Women's Place in India", *Imprint*, XV (February, 1976), 13-19.
4. See Ramabai or Evelyn Gedge and Mithan Choksi, eds., *Women in Modern India* (Bombay, 1929) for accounting of the difficulties faced by women in the early twentieth century who decided to undertake non-traditional roles in the modern world.
5. See Pratima Asthana's *Women's Movement in India* (Delhi, 1974), pp. 24-39 for a discussion of the leading reformers interested in the cause of women.
6. *Ibid.*
7. This is a point of view shared by many women in India today. Interviews by author with Srimati S. Bakhshi, Professor of Home Economics at the J. & K. State Teachers College, Srinagar, July, 1975.
8. See, for example, *Roshni*, the journal of the All-India Women's Conference, Nehru Museum & Library, New Delhi.

9. Gandhi in *Harijan*, 6 (February, 1938), 468.
10. M. K. Gandhi, "What is Woman's Role?" *Harijan*, 8 (February, 1940), 12-14. Although agreeing women should have equal status with men, Gandhi felt women were uniquely suited for motherhood and that it would be "degrading both for man and woman that woman should be called upon or induced to forsake the hearth and shoulder the rifle for the protection of that hearth. It is a reversion to barbarity and the beginning of the end." (*Ibid.*)
11. The British had been unwilling to legislate in social and religious matters except for action in extreme areas—such as the abolition of sati and infanticide. The new Government of India, therefore, had limited precedent for using legislation to improve the status of women.
12. *Towards Equality : Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in India* (New Delhi, 1974). (Hereafter referred to as *Report*) Section 1 : 01.
13. *Report*, 2 : 06.
14. *Ibid.*, 2 : 15.
15. *Ibid.*, 2 : 36. As the level of education and fertility are inversely related, it is not surprising that only 15% of the couples in the reproductive age group are practicing family planning (2 : 30).
16. *Ibid.*, Table I, p. 153.
17. *Ibid.*, 5 : 230. The number of qualified women doctors is about 25 per 100 men although the ratio of employed physicians is only 6·1 per 100 men due to underutilization and migration.
18. *Ibid.*, 5 : 213. See also Promilla Kapur's excellent studies on the working woman in India, *The Changing Status of the Working Woman* (Delhi, 1974) and *Marriage and the Working Woman in India* (Delhi, 1970).
19. *Ibid.*, 5 : 266-268.
20. *Ibid.*, Table XLIII, 5 : 273.
21. *Ibid.*, 5 : 35.
22. *Ibid.*, Table I, 6 : 13. These are estimated figures not actual statistics.
23. *Ibid.*, Table IV, 6 : 15.
24. *Ibid.*, 6 : 25. The Committee believes that the low proportion of women among primary school teachers and the growth of separate institutions for women are obstacles to the growth of quality education for girls.
25. *Ibid.*, Table XIX, 6 : 50.
26. *Ibid.*, Table XX, 6 : 52.
27. *Ibid.*, Table XVIII, 6 : 49.
28. *Ibid.*, 6 : 46.
29. *Ibid.*, 6 : 47.
30. *Ibid.*, 7 : 2.
31. *Ibid.*, 7 : 24.
32. *Ibid.*, Table II, 7 : 21. The difference between male and female voter turnout has declined.

33. *Ibid.*, 7 : 36-37.
34. *Ibid.*, 7 : 47.
35. *Ibid.*, 7 : 49. The primary women's organizations, such as the All-India Women's Conference, have worked primarily for social and economic reform and are not politically oriented. Even the trade union movement has not mobilized women to assert their legal and constitutional rights.
36. *Ibid.*, 7 : 98.
37. *Ibid.*, 7 : 99.
38. Tara Ali Baig, the well-known social reformer and President of the Indian Council for Child Welfare, argues that women are suffering in India today because they have had to enter a new economic world while continuing their domestic and marital lives unaltered. Men, on the other hand, have not had to make any adaptations to modern life. She suggests that a militant women's movement would remove the one element from the family that presently holds the country together. Rather Baig calls for a return to the ancient values and an end to the glorification of the male. Baig, "Women's Place in India", p. 19.

